

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued
For actions of

June 11, 1953
June 10, 1953
83rd-1st, No. 106

CONTENTS

Agri'l Adjustment Act.....23,4,35	Housing.....4	Roads.....2,27,38
Appropriations.....2,40,41	Interest rates.....4,14	R.E.A. loans.....2,10
Conservation.....22	Lands, grazing.....20	Small business.....5
Disaster relief.....40	Livestock.....12,21,28	Sugar.....6
Economic controls.....1	Marketing quotas.....2	Textile industry.....7
Farm storage.....39	Nomination.....8	Trade, foreign.....6,16
Flammable fabrics.....9	Packaging.....17	Treaties.....11
Foreign aid.....15,37	Patents.....30	Veterans' benefits.....19
Government operations.....24	Prices, support.....37	Water.....29,31
Hawaii statehood.....23	Reclamation.....3,32	Wheat.....2,18,33,34,37

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses received President's message recommending shipment of surplus wheat to Pakistan. House Rules Committee cleared trade agreements extension bill. Senate completed final congressional action on 3rd supplemental appropriation bill. Sen. Aiken introduced bill amending wheat marketing law. Sen. Humphrey introduced and discussed bill to increase carryover and acreage allotments for corn and wheat. Sen. Aiken, and Reps. Hope, et al, introduced bills to transfer surplus wheat to Pakistan. Rep. Hagen, et al, introduced bills establishing 3-year base for determining cotton quotas, and Rep. Hagen discussed those bills. Sen. Morse introduced and discussed measure to provide timber access roads. Senate conferees were appointed on economic controls bill. Senate debated Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill.

SENATE

1. ECONOMIC CONTROLS. Sens. Capehart, Bricker, Bennett, Bush, Maybank, Fulbright, and Robertson were appointed as conferees on S. 1081, authorizing temporary economic controls (p. 6531-35). House conferees have not yet been appointed.
2. APPROPRIATIONS. Adopted the conference report on H.R. 4664, third supplemental appropriation bill for 1953 (p. 6539). This bill will now be sent to the President. The bill includes the following items for this Department: \$3,150,000 (to be derived by transfer from any other appropriations available to the Department) to begin formulation of acreage-allotment and marketing-quota programs on wheat and cotton; \$5,000,000 for construction of timber access roads to permit removal of insect-infested and insect-killed trees in Montana and Idaho; and \$7,500,000 for the rural telephone loan program. Began debate on H.R. 5174, Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill for 1954 (pp. 6539-40, 6542-46, 6549-51, 6554).
3. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment S. 2097, to increase to \$33 million the authorization for construction of the Eklutna Project, Alaska (S. Rept. 383) (pp. 6497-98). Received an Oklahoma Legislature resolution requesting that gas-production companies in the Guymon-Hugoton field be permitted to deliver natural gas to irrigation farmers in the area to help alleviate drought without being classified as a utility company (p. 6491).
4. HOUSING. The Banking and Currency Committee reported with amendments S. 1993, to amend the National Housing Act and the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 with respect to maximum interest rates (S. Rept. 386) (p. 6495).

5. **SMALL BUSINESS.** The Rules and Administration Committee reported a resolution increasing the limit of expenditures for the Select Committee on Small Business (p. 6495).
6. **SUGAR; FOREIGN TRADE.** Received the treaty, dated Aug. 31, 1952, prolonging the international agreement regarding regulation and marketing of sugar, signed at London, May 6, 1937 (Ex. L, 83d Cong.) (p. 6554).
7. **TEXTILE INDUSTRY.** Sen. Maybank spoke on the rising economic position of the South, emphasizing the growth and development of the textile industry there (pp. 6535-39).
8. **NOMINATION** of Nelson Aldrich Rockefeller as Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare was confirmed (p. 6556).
9. **FLAMMABLE FABRICS.** The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) without amendment H.R. 5069, to prohibit the movement in interstate commerce of highly flammable fabrics (p. D535).
10. **ELECTRIFICATION.** Received an amendment to the agricultural appropriation bill submitted by Sen. Young to increase to 20% the amount of money which may be allocated to a State from the REA contingency fund for rural electrification (p. 6490).
11. **TREATIES.** Sen. Brieker inserted two resolutions and an editorial in favor of his proposed constitutional amendment to limit the treaty-making power (pp. 6491-92).
12. **CATTLE INDUSTRY.** Sen. Thye inserted an American National Cattlemen's Association memorial to Congress and the Secretary setting forth the proposals by which the cattle industry is attempting to find a solution to its problems (pp. 6493-94).
13. **EXPENDITURES.** Sen. Schoepel inserted a Wichita Manufacturers' Club resolution urging Congress to eliminate wasteful operations and unnecessary spending, and to reduce the size and activities of the Federal Government (p. 6494).
14. **INTEREST RATES.** Sens. Humphrey, Morse, Maybank, Goldwater, and others, discussed recent increased interest rates, and Sen. Humphrey recommended a congressional investigation on the effects of this new policy on our economy (pp. 6511-31). During discussion of this matter Sen. Humphrey stated, "the new administration dealt a double-barreled blow at agriculture through its new high-interest rate policy" by a boost in interest rates on CCC supported loans and on foreign purchases of agricultural commodities by the Export-Import Bank (pp. 6525-6).

HOUSE

15. **FOREIGN AID.** Both Houses received the President's message recommending authorization for shipment of up to 1 million tons of surplus CCC wheat to Pakistan; to H. Agriculture and S. Agriculture and Forestry Committees (H. Doc. 171) (pp. 6540, 6563-4). The message states, "To make it available to Pakistan will create no additional Government expenditure at this time other than the cost of transportation. In order that the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation will not be impaired, I am recommending that the legislation include authority for the Commodity Credit Corporation to recover its costs, including

interest, through an appropriation when the costs of the programs have been ascertained." The message proposes that up to 700,000 tons of wheat be made available as a grant, and that it will be determined later whether additional shipments will be supplied as a grant or a loan.

16. FOREIGN TRADE. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of H.R. 5495, to continue for 1 year the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (p. 6584).
17. PACKAGING. Rep. O'Hara spoke on the progress made by the Green Giant Company, Glencoe, Minn., which is "the world's largest packer of peas and corn," during the 50 years of its existence (pp. 6577-8).
18. WHEAT MARKETING QUOTA. As reported, H.R. 5451, to amend the wheat-marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, includes the following provisions:

Increases the minimum permissible national wheat-acreage allotment from 55 million to 66 million acres, a reduction of about 12 million acres, or 15%, of present wheat acreage; changes the exemption from marketing quotas in the case of farm acreage from 15 to 25 acres, and for bushel production from 200 to 400 acres; and establishes the penalty for exceeding the farm marketing quota at 45% of the parity price per bushel as of May 1 of the crop year.

Establishes a National acreage reserve, not exceeding 1% of the national allotment to be apportioned to counties in addition to the regular county allotments to relieve inequity resulting from the rise of new wheat producing areas; provides that the acreage reserve for new wheat farms of 3% of the allotted acreage be placed on a state level (previously on a county level) for greater flexibility of use; adds "the past acreage of wheat" as another factor in establishing farm wheat allotments; and limits the so-called Barden amendment protection to wheat farms acquired only from 1950 on (previously 1940) by the U. S. for national-defense purposes.

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

9. VETERANS' BENEFITS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Elliott favoring his bill, H.R. 3167, which would increase education and training allowance of veterans pursuing on-farm training, and inserting several Nat'l Ass'n. of State Approval Agencies resolutions urging passage of the bill (pp. A3523-4).
20. GRAZING LANDS. Rep. D'Ewart inserted an article from the Miles City (Mont.) Star criticizing the opposition to H.R. 4023, the stockmen's grazing bill as "the result of a misinterpretation" (pp. A3528-9).
Sen. Morse inserted 3 newspaper editorials opposing H.R. 4023, the stockmen's grazing bill as "a slick rights-grabbing scheme on behalf of special interests" (pp. A3547-8).
21. LIVESTOCK. Sen. Robertson inserted State Sen. Harry C. Stuart (Va.) speech delivered before an annual 4-H Club discussing the program of grass-fed cattle (pp. A3530-1).
22. CONSERVATION. Rep. Abbitt inserted an American Forests article discussing the contributions of certain individuals to the "wise-use management and conservation of our renewable natural resources of forests, soil, water and wildlife" (pp. A3532-3).

23. HAWAII STATEHOOD. Sen. Maybank inserted a Dillon (S.C.) Herald article commenting on Sen. Johnston's speech in which he opposed statehood for Hawaii (p. A3533).
24. GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS. Sen. Capehart inserted an American Trade Ass'n Executive Journal article discussing and outlining some of the problems of Government operations (pp. A3538-40).
25. INFORMATION. Sen. Morse inserted a St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial commenting on the recent telecast of the President and four of his Cabinet members (p. A3540).
26. IMMIGRATION. Sen. Watkins inserted a Deseret News (Salt Lake City) editorial favoring S. 1917, a bill to permit entry of 240,000 immigrants (pp. A3542-3).
27. ROADS. Sen. Mansfield inserted two newspaper editorial favoring a nationwide program for development of better roads (pp. A3543-5).

BILLS INTRODUCED

28. SHEEP INDUSTRY. S. 2074, by Sen. Welker, for the relief of certain Basque sheepherders; to Judiciary Committee (p. 6496). Remarks of author (p. 6497).
29. WATER CONSERVATION. S. 2094, by Sen. Butler, to facilitate the development and construction of water conservation facilities by States and municipalities; to Public Works Committee (p. 6497).
30. PATENTS. S. 2095, by Sen. Tobey, to authorize the extension of patents covering inventions whose practice was prevented or curtailed during certain emergency periods by service of the patent owner in the Armed Forces or by production controls; to Judiciary Committee (p. 6497).
31. WATER RESOURCES. S. 2096, by Sen. Barrett, to require Federal officers, employees, agencies, and instrumentalities to act in accordance with and submit to the laws of certain States relative to the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of water; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 6497).
32. RECLAMATION. S. 2097, by Sen. Cordon, to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the construction of the Eklutna project; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 6497). Remarks of author (pp. 6497-8).
33. WHEAT. S. 2099, by Sens. Aiken, Schoeppel and Young, to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 6497).
34. ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS. S. 2102, by Sens. Humphrey, Murray and Kerr, to increase allowances for carryover and acreage allotments for corn and wheat and to establish a special contingency reserve; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 6497). Remarks of author (pp. 6499-501).
35. AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT. S. 2106, by Sens. Kuchel et al; H.R. 5655, by Rep. Hunter; H.R. 5657, by Rep. Dempsey; H.R. 5658, by Rep. Fernandez; H.R. 5662, by Rep. Neader; H.R. 5666, by Rep. Sheppard; H.R. 5668, by Rep. Young; H.R. 5669, by Rep. Hagen; and H.R. 5672, by Rep. Rhodes; to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to Agriculture Committees (pp. 6497, 6584). Remarks of Rep. Hagen (pp. A3515-6).

WHEAT FOR PAKISTAN

MESSAGE

FROM

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

TRANSMITTING

RECOMMENDATION FOR GRANT OF WHEAT TO PAKISTAN

JUNE 10, 1953.—Referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 10, 1953.*

To the Congress of the United States:

The people of Pakistan are faced with famine, and they have asked our help in meeting disaster.

We are fortunate to be in a position to offer help at this time, for we have an abundance of wheat. I strongly believe that we should do so. Accordingly, I urge the Congress to make possible the shipment to Pakistan of up to 1 million long tons of United States wheat.

The specter of famine confronts the people of Pakistan at a crucial time in their growth as a young, free nation. Unchecked, it could undermine the very democratic principles and institutions to which Pakistan is dedicated.

The crisis is largely a result of a calamity of nature. Pakistan was self-sufficient in food until severe drought, in 2 successive years, struck the wheat-producing area of west Pakistan.

The wheat consumption of the people of west Pakistan averages less than 12 ounces per day in a diet consisting very largely of this grain. Today, Government wheat reserves have fallen to the vanishing point.

The immediate need of Pakistan is to obtain abroad up to 1.5 million long tons of wheat both for consumption and for a small working reserve during the next 11 months. Of this total the Government of Pakistan expects to be able to obtain about 400,000 tons of wheat

with its own and other aid resources. Canada and Australia have both made generous grants for wheat to Pakistan. There is no important source in the free world other than the United States able to furnish additional help.

Pakistan has, therefore, appealed to the United States for 1 million tons of wheat. Its approach has been one of dignity—as one sovereign democracy to another—stating a real and urgent need. Between the people of Pakistan and the people of the United States, there exists a strong bond of friendship. I am sure that the people of the United States desire their Government to respond rapidly and effectively to Pakistan's request.

Pakistan has endeavored to keep its request for United States aid to a minimum. The Secretary of State and the Director for Mutual Security sent a special mission, headed by Dr. Harry Reed, Dean of the College of Agriculture of Purdue University, to study at first hand the food situation in Pakistan. Mr. Dulles and Governor Stassen have also visited Pakistan within the last 2 weeks. With the help of their observations, careful consideration has been given the Reed mission's recommendations.

One critical fact is that the Government of Pakistan is suffering grave financial difficulties. It has already taken rigorous steps to remedy both the food outlook and its general economic disabilities, and these efforts give some hope for future self-sufficiency. But Pakistan's gold and foreign exchange holdings are barely enough to meet its legal requirements for currency backing and essential working capital. Moreover, Pakistan has little prospect of an exportable wheat surplus which would permit repayment of a loan in kind. Its export earnings and all its prospective financial resources are needed to meet the demand of economic development essential to prevent future food and financial crises. A dollar loan would make it impossible for Pakistan to obtain further necessary development loans from international lending institutions.

These considerations make certain conclusions evident. Pakistan needs a grant of up to 700,000 tons of United States wheat for relief purposes according to the best available estimates. The urgency of the need is underscored by the Reed mission's recommendation for delivery of 100,000 tons of United States aid wheat in Karachi by August 15 of this year.

This grant would serve a double purpose. It would meet Pakistan's immediate and pressing need for food and at the same time provide local currency for economic development programs. The rupee receipts from the sale of wheat would be placed in a counterpart fund under joint Pakistan-United States administration. This fund will be used for development purposes with emphasis placed on increased food production in Pakistan to lessen the danger of future shortages.

In addition to the 700,000 tons, Pakistan may also need up to 300,000 tons as a necessary working reserve of wheat. The exact amount needed for this purpose can only be determined later; and only then can we determine whether the remainder of our aid should be supplied as a grant or a loan.

Fortunately, we do have the capacity to help at the present time. Our large wheat reserves have created a grave storage problem, demanding unusual and sometimes costly storage measures.

I propose, therefore, that the Congress authorize me to make available to Pakistan up to 1 million tons of wheat out of stocks held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. This wheat already is owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, having been obtained under the price support program. To make it available to Pakistan will create no additional Government expenditure at this time other than the cost of transportation. In order that the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation will not be impaired, I am recommending that the legislation include authority for the Commodity Credit Corporation to recover its costs, including interest, through an appropriation when the costs of the programs have been ascertained.

The United States Government proposes to designate, with the concurrence of the Government of Pakistan, a group to observe the receipt and distribution of wheat in Pakistan. The group's reports will be available to the Congress.

To provide sufficient United States aid in time, it is imperative that the grain begin to move from United States ports by the end of this month.

I strongly urge that the Congress make such prompt action possible.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

○

83^D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5659

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 10, 1953

Mr. HOPE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

A BILL

To provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the
4 Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to
5 make available to the President out of wheat stocks acquired
6 through price-support operations not to exceed one million
7 long tons of wheat, during the period ending June 30, 1954,
8 for transfer to the Government of Pakistan upon such terms
9 and conditions as the President determines appropriate, of
10 which seven hundred thousand tons may be made available
11 in order to alleviate starvation and mass suffering threatened

1 by famine conditions in Pakistan and not to exceed three
2 hundred thousand tons to provide such reserve supply as he
3 may determine to be a necessary supplement to such emer-
4 gency assistance. Commodity Credit Corporation shall de-
5 liver the wheat on board vessels in United States ports as
6 directed by the President.

7 SEC. 2. For the purpose of making payment to the
8 Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities disposed of
9 hereunder, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated,
10 out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appro-
11 priated, such sums as are equal to the Corporation's invest-
12 ment in such commodities, including handling costs, plus
13 the costs incurred in making deliveries hereunder. Any
14 funds or other assets available to the Commodity Credit
15 Corporation may be used, in advance of such appropriation
16 or payments, for carrying out the purposes of this Act.

17 SEC. 3. No assistance under authority of this Act shall
18 be made available until an agreement is entered into between
19 Pakistan and the United States containing the following
20 undertakings, and any others the President may determine
21 to be desirable to carry out the purposes of this Act, on the
22 part of Pakistan:

23 (a) To distribute the supplies made available under this
24 Act, as well as similar supplies obtained locally or imported

1 from outside sources by the Government of Pakistan, among
2 the people of Pakistan without discrimination.

3 (b) To give full and continuous publicity in Pakistan
4 to the assistance furnished by the United States.

5 (c) To permit persons designated by the Government of
6 the United States to observe without restriction the distribu-
7 tion in Pakistan of supplies made available under authority
8 of this Act.

9 (d) To deposit in a special account amounts of the cur-
10 rency of Pakistan equivalent to the amounts of such cur-
11 rency accruing to the Government of Pakistan from the im-
12 port and sale of commodities furnished as a grant hereunder,
13 this account to be utilized as may be agreed upon by the
14 United States and the Government of Pakistan for the benefit
15 of the people of Pakistan in programs to increase food pro-
16 duction and in other projects and programs in the mutual
17 interest of the United States and Pakistan.

18 (e) To allocate to the use of the Government of the
19 United States 5 per centum of the local currency account
20 established in subsection (d) for use, in accordance with
21 applicable United States laws, for local currency require-
22 ments of the United States, including administrative and
23 operating expenses in Pakistan in connection with assistance
24 supplied by the United States.

1 (f) To pursue all appropriate measures to reduce its
2 relief needs and to increase production and supply and im-
3 prove distribution of foodstuffs within Pakistan so as to
4 lessen the danger of similar emergencies in the future.

5 SEC. 4. All or any part of the assistance provided here-
6 under shall be terminated by the President whenever he, or
7 Congress by concurrent resolution, determines that because
8 of changed conditions continuation of assistance is unneces-
9 sary or undesirable. Termination of assistance to Pakistan
10 under this section may include the termination of deliveries
11 of all supplies scheduled under this Act and not yet delivered.

12 SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this Act shall affect the
13 applicability of section 1415 of the Supplemental Appro-
14 priation Act, 1953, or other provisions of law to the local
15 currency allocated to the use of the United States in ac-
16 cordance with the agreement provided for in section 3.

83d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5659

A BILL

To provide for the transfer of price-support
wheat to Pakistan.

By Mr. HOPE

JUNE 10, 1953

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

83^d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 2112

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 10 (legislative day, JUNE 8), 1953

Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. TAFT) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

A BILL

To provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the
4 Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed
5 to make available to the President out of wheat stocks
6 acquired through price-support operations not to exceed
7 one million long tons of wheat, during the period ending
8 June 30, 1954, for transfer to the Government of Pakistan
9 upon such terms and conditions as the President determines
10 appropriate, of which seven hundred thousand tons may be
11 made available in order to alleviate starvation and mass suf-

1 fering threatened by famine conditions in Pakistan and not to
2 exceed three hundred thousand tons to provide such reserve
3 supply as he may determine to be a necessary supplement
4 to such emergency assistance. Commodity Credit Corpora-
5 tion shall deliver the wheat on board vessels in United
6 States ports as directed by the President.

7 SEC. 2. For the purpose of making payments to the
8 Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities disposed of
9 hereunder, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated,
10 out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropri-
11 ated, such sums as are equal to the Corporation's investment
12 in such commodities, including handling costs, plus the costs
13 incurred in making deliveries hereunder. Any funds or other
14 assets available to the Commodity Credit Corporation may be
15 used, in advance of such appropriation or payments, for
16 carrying out the purposes of this Act.

17 SEC. 3. No assistance under authority of this Act shall
18 be made available until an agreement is entered into between
19 Pakistan and the United States containing the following
20 undertakings, and any others the President may determine to
21 be desirable to carry out the purposes of this Act, on the part
22 of Pakistan:

23 (a) To distribute the supplies made available under this
24 Act, as well as similar supplies obtained locally or imported

1 from outside sources by the Government of Pakistan, among
2 the people of Pakistan without discrimination.

3 (b) To give full and continuous publicity in Pakistan
4 to the assistance furnished by the United States.

5 (c) To permit persons designated by the Government
6 of the United States to observe without restriction the distri-
7 bution in Pakistan of supplies made available under authority
8 of this Act.

9 (d) To deposit in a special account amounts of the cur-
10 rency of Pakistan equivalent to the amounts of such cur-
11 rency accruing to the Government of Pakistan from the im-
12 port and sale of commodities furnished as a grant hereunder,
13 this account to be utilized as may be agreed upon by the
14 United States and the Government of Pakistan for the bene-
15 fit of the people of Pakistan in programs to increase food
16 production and in other projects and programs in the mutual
17 interest of the United States and Pakistan.

18 (e) To allocate to the use of the Government of the
19 United States 5 per centum of the local currency account
20 established in subsection (d) for use, in accordance with
21 applicable United States laws, for local currency require-
22 ments of the United States, including administrative and
23 operating expenses in Pakistan in connection with assistance
24 supplied by the United States.

1 (f) To pursue all appropriate measures to reduce its
2 relief needs and to increase production and supply and im-
3 prove distribution of foodstuffs within Pakistan so as to
4 lessen the danger of similar emergencies in the future.

5 SEC. 4. All or any part of the assistance provided here-
6 under shall be terminated by the President whenever he, or
7 Congress by concurrent resolution, determines that because
8 of changed conditions continuation of assistance is unneces-
9 sary or undesirable. Termination of assistance to Pakistan
10 under this section may include the termination of deliveries
11 of all supplies scheduled under this Act and not yet delivered.

12 SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this Act shall affect the
13 applicability of section 1415 of the Supplemental Appro-
14 priation Act, 1953 or other provisions of law to the local
15 currency allocated to the use of the United States in ac-
16 cordance with the agreement provided for in section 3.

83^d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 2112

A BILL

To provide for the transfer of price-support
wheat to Pakistan.

By Mr. AIKEN, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. SMITH of
New Jersey, and Mr. TART

JUNE 10 (legislative day, JUNE 8), 1953
Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

immediately following completion of action on the appropriation bill.

Mr. MORSE. I shall not object, but it is necessary for me to leave the city on a late plane tomorrow night. I find myself in disagreement with the mandatory section of the District of Columbia crime bill, and I have a body of data which I wish to present to the Senate in opposition to that provision of the bill. I may find it necessary during the course of the debate on the appropriation bill to make my record against the mandatory sentencing section of the District crime bill, because I necessarily must leave here tomorrow night so that I may speak to the Democrats of my State on Friday night.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, the Senator will have the privilege, if he feels that time is running out on him, to obtain the floor in his own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5174) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLANDERS in the chair). Without objection; it is so ordered.

FEDERAL AID IN TORNADO-STRICKEN AREAS IN MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, since the Senate convened today I have talked with the Governor of Massachusetts, Governor Herter, who spoke from the city hall in Worcester. He informs me that he has sent a telegram to the President of the United States advising him that he has declared an emergency in the city of Worcester. The President's office advises me that the matter has been referred to the Civil Defense Department, under former Governor Peterson.

There is available approximately \$20 million for the entire United States. It is estimated, according to the Governor of Massachusetts, that the damage from the tornado in Massachusetts, in towns outside Worcester, is approximately \$30 million. In the city of Worcester the assessors estimate the damage to be somewhere between \$30 million and \$50 million.

At the request of the Governor of Massachusetts on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution and request that it be referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations

in order that, after proper consideration, and as soon as possible, when the amount is determined and when a determination is made as to the appropriate aid from the Federal Government in one of the worst catastrophes we in Massachusetts have ever suffered, proper assistance may be rendered by the Federal Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 118) submitted by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

Resolved, That the President is requested to make available, from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated to carry out the act entitled "An act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes," approved September 30, 1950, not less than \$25 million for assistance to the State of Massachusetts, the city of Worcester, Mass., and neighboring cities and towns to alleviate hardship and suffering and to repair property damage caused by the tornado which struck the area in the vicinity of Worcester on June 9, 1953.

TRANSFER OF PRICE-SUPPORT WHEAT TO PAKISTAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 171)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLANDERS in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States relating to the shipment of wheat to Pakistan. Inasmuch as the message has been read in the House of Representatives today, it is not necessary to have it read in the Senate. Without objection, the message will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry without reading.

(For text of message from the President, see House proceedings of today's RECORD.)

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in relation to the message from the President of the United States which was just laid before the Senate, on behalf of myself, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2112) to provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and other Senators), was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT AT MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an address which was delivered this afternoon at Minneapolis, Minn., by the President of the United States.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT DELIVERED AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

I thank you sincerely for the honor of your invitation to be with you today.

Yours is one of our Nation's most distinguished and enterprising organizations. You are young and responsible people, with impressive careers and achievements already recorded to your credit. My own life has been spent with America's young people. The grave decisions that I have been compelled to make have been vindicated by their skill, their sense of responsibility, and their sacrifice. My faith in them is my unbounded faith in America itself.

Because you are both young and responsible, you know what is your greatest responsibility of all—tomorrow—the whole future of freedom.

In the minds of all of you—as in my own mind—is a long list of critical subjects confronting our people today. I wish I could discuss all of them with you—the problems of healthy foreign trade; the regulation of Government expenditures; the achieving of a more just tax structure; the development of sound agricultural programs; the great work to be done in the fields of education, health and welfare.

There is, however, one matter that overshadows all of these. It is the constant, controlling consideration in our national life today. It is—our Nation's security.

Quickly we can see how this one issue effectively rules all others. It alone comes close to fixing the level of Government budgets—when 2 of every 3 dollars spent by our Federal Government go to defense purposes. It thereby almost automatically sets the requirements for Federal taxes. It directly affects the welfare of our farms, so dependent upon wide opportunities for export. And it is intimately bound up with foreign trade—for our own imports of such critical products as nickel and cobalt and mica are essential to our national security.

It is no wonder that our national security is so vast a matter—for the struggle in which freedom today is engaged is quite literally a total and universal struggle. It engages every aspect of our lives. It is waged in every arena in which a challenged civilization must fight to live.

It is a military struggle—on the battlefields of Korea, of Indochina, or Malaya.

It is an economic struggle—in which the equivalent of a lost battle can be suffered in a ruined rice crop in Asia, or in the lagging of a critical production line in America.

It is a political struggle—speaking at the conference tables of the United Nations, in the daily diplomatic exchanges that flood the cable wires and telephone lines of the world.

It is a scientific struggle—in which atomic energy plants and colossal research projects can produce terrible wonders matching in fateful effect the inventions of the wheel or of gunpowder.

It is an intellectual struggle—for the press and the radio, every spoken and printed word, can either inspire or weaken men's faith in freedom.

It is a spiritual struggle—for one of communism's basic assumptions about the nature of men is that they are incapable of ruling themselves, incapable of attaining the spiritual standards and strength to solve national problems when these require voluntary personal sacrifice for the common good. This is the Communist justification for regimentation. All this we deny. And we must seek in our churches, our schools, our homes and our daily lives the clearness of mind and strongness of heart to guard the chance to live in freedom.

For this whole struggle, in the deepest sense, is waged neither for land nor for food nor for power—but for the soul of man himself.

social-welfare schemes, they have stifled industrial initiative by running up the costs of doing business? Have they, either blindly in their altruism, or in surrendering to various kinds of pressures, lost the sense of economic balance? Have they saddled themselves with burdens too heavy for their industries to bear, in the face of the competitive situation both domestically and abroad?

If so, it is hardly for them to point a finger of scorn and to shout, "Unfair!" at those regions where business foresight has permitted technological progress to be passed on in good measure to the consumer in the form of lower and competitive prices for products. Nor can any good come of inviting one region to transfer the faults and ailments which caused its hardships to other regions that are proving more adaptable for certain industries.

Instead, it is my opinion that if any such region or section exists in America, it would be well advised to take courage from the example of dynamic Americanism which the new industrial South offers. Courage, yes, and inspiration and counsel.

Freedom and opportunity; youthfulness and vigor; fair measure given for fair value received. These are the watchwords of southern industry. This, after all, is what most Americans are striving for—a constantly higher scale of living, more and better products and the money with which to buy a fair share of them. If all industry, labor, and agriculture can move ahead together toward this greater goal, the well-being and security of the entire national community will ever be uplifted, and America need never fear for the future.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it recess until noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4664) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 8, 1953, p. 6420.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing

its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 4664, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 9, 1953.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Numbered 1, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 15, and 20 to the bill (H. R. 4664) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes," and concur therein; that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 19, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AGENCY

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"The amount made available under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act 1953, for the Office of Rent Stabilization is hereby increased from '\$11,000,000' to '\$11,385,000': *Provided*, That said increase of \$385,000 shall be available only for terminal leave and shall not be used for such payment unless the Administrator shall personally certify the payment of such leave."

Mr. BRIDGES. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 19.

The motion was agreed to.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside, and that calendar No. 377, H. R. 5174, the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriations bill, may be taken up at this time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished acting majority leader when the bill, report, and hearings were made available?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it is now proposed that the bill be taken up by unanimous consent because only 2 days have elapsed since the bill was reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations. In the normal course of events, tomorrow would be the day when the bill would be called up. However, the Senate Committee on Appropriations has reported no amendment whatever to the bill as it passed the House. The committee has not raised or lowered the amount by a dollar. The committee has neither added nor subtracted any language, either in the form of legislation on an appropriation bill or otherwise. Under those circumstances, I wonder if the Senator from Illinois would not be willing to have the bill taken up at this time, since it was reported on Monday.

Mr. DOUGLAS. At what hour on Monday?

Mr. KNOWLAND. In the afternoon.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Only two calendar days have elapsed since then.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Frankly, I say to the Senator from Illinois that I fully realize that any Senator may raise objection to having the bill called up at this time. In the unusual situation that the bill as it came from the House has not been changed by the Senate com-

mittee, I was hopeful the Senate might consider the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, in the interest of expediting the business of the Senate, and in the hope that if we dispose of it and a number of other bills which are now before the Senate, we might then be able to recess from Thursday to Monday, in order to give the Committee on Foreign Relations an opportunity to work on the mutual aid bill, and afford a similar opportunity to some other committees, the members of which have been trying to be both on the floor and in hearings at the same time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is not my intention to delay the procedure of the Senate, and in this instance I shall not object to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from California. However, in general I think it is very important that Senators be given three full days in which to study appropriation bills, the hearings on them, and the reports, as prescribed by section 139 (a) of the standing rules of the Senate.

With the understanding that the contemplated procedure will not constitute a precedent, and that in the future three full calendar days will be afforded Senators for consideration of appropriation bills and for study of necessary documents, I shall not object in this instance. However, in the future I shall raise points of order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understand, of course, that the acting majority leader cannot say how long it will take to dispose of the bill, but I wish to ask him for his best estimate, because I should like to know whether he thinks it will be possible for us to begin consideration of the bill relating to the District of Columbia before the afternoon is over.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As the distinguished Senator from Oregon can appreciate, I have no way of estimating. I understand some amendments may be offered to the appropriation bill, inasmuch as the bill as reported by the committee is in the form in which it came from the House; but I do not believe it will be necessary to pursue the course which was followed in the case of the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill. However, whether the Treasury-Post Office bill can be disposed of in 1 hour or 2 hours I am simply in no position at this moment to say. I am certain the Senator from Oregon appreciates that.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator contemplate that when action is completed on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, which he now asks to have made the unfinished business of the Senate, we shall take up the District of Columbia crime bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should say that if the unexpected happened, and the appropriation bill was quickly disposed of, as on rare occasions I have seen an appropriation bill finished, we would then take up and at least begin debate on the District of Columbia crime bill; otherwise, we shall take it up tomorrow,

"A-6386367, Kogerman, Sulev Kristjan.
 "56133/591, Kuljaca, Jovo Petro.
 "A-6847740, Kwong, Man Hong.
 "A-7087401, Lautman, Zoltan.
 "A-6983796, Lee, Joseph Alexander.
 "A-6694226, Li, Kuan.
 "A-6625627, Li, Frances.
 "A-6794979, Lieber, Leopold.
 "A-6794944, Loh, Ellen (Ai Lien Loh, Ellen Lo).
 "A-7757809, Loo, Ping Yok.
 "A-6995548, Lowy, Gustav.
 "A-6805570, Odinak, Alac (Elya Odinak).
 "A-6373385, Petrova, Olga Gregorie.
 "A-6904771, Pizyc, Stefa.
 "A-6934637, Popoff, Sergei Vasilievich.
 "A-6390227, Raid, Kaljo, alias Kaljo Raamann.
 "A-7073587, Rizk, George Sliman, formerly George Sliman Rizk Abu Judom.
 "A-7463362, Sabel, Bela.
 "A-7463363, Sabel, Ilona (nee Adler).
 "A-7903795, Sabel, Irene.
 "A-6771472, Salah, Nadim John.
 "A-6938007, Schwartz, Hillel Aron.
 "A-7243320, Shalom, Yacoub Raphael, alias Jack Raphael Shalom.
 "A-6867165, Sommerstein, Emil.
 "A-6886844, Szeto, Shih-Chuan.
 "A-7290210, Sztrachman, Aleksander.
 "A-9734415, Tai, Ying Wah.
 "A-6983820, Taub, Ladislav Vasile, alias Lawrence Taub.
 "A-6628885, Vaughan, Nelle Ladd.
 "A-7752326, Wang, Chi-Yuan.
 "A-6849833, Wang, Virginia Fu-Chuang.
 "A-6904341, Wechsler, Samuel.
 "A-6886824, Weiss, Josef.
 "A-6844256, Wenger, Irving (Izrael Wegier).
 "A-6844257, Wenger, Ida (Chaja Wegier).
 "A-7130820, Berland, Felicja, alias Felicia Berland.
 "A-7182346, Borowiec, Andrzej Stanislaw.
 "A-9758751, Bracco, Giovanni.
 "A-7139089, Bracco, Simon Guisto.
 "A-8057048, Cugliani, John, or Ivan Kuljanic or Ivan Milan Kuljanic.
 "A-7046293, David, Masouda M. S. S.
 "A-7139010, Deblinger, Srul.
 "A-6959748, Deblinger, Kate (nee Guttman).
 "A-7934151, Fable, Joseph, or Joe Fable.
 "A-7079925, Fulop, Jenő.
 "A-7144001, Goldberger, Magdalena.
 "A-6528723, Halpern, Aron.
 "A-6159671, Joles, Joel Leib.
 "A-6737779, Klein, Moritz.
 "A-6891804, Kohn, Judith.
 "A-6755538, Llang, Tsch.
 "A-7779160, Loo, Shou Ming.
 "A-6949995, Neufeld, Josef.
 "0300-299946, Paema, Ernst.
 "A-7244193, Picinich, Matteo.
 "A-7123477, Rawicki, Jerzy Jacob alias Jerry Rawicki.
 "A-7276711, Sang, Chang Chuan.
 "A-6934990, Schnabel, Moses.
 "A-7828578, Surian, Giovanni.
 "A-6849828, Tai, Gertrude Loe or Hsiao Tso Loe.
 "A-6620485, Tsang, John Lien-Kwei.
 "A-9555577, Veider, Carl (Karl) Alfred.
 "A-7118759, Weiss, Ervin, alias Erwin Weiss.
 "A-7118778, Weiss, Frieda.
 "A-6238175, Yang, Peter Quay, also known as Yang Quay and Yang Kwel.
 "A-6210613, Litynski, Zygmunt Leopold or Zygmunt Litynski.
 "A-7383205, Iliescu, Dumitru.
 "A-6405961, Lin, Chi-Sun."
 And the Senate agree to the same.

LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
 RUTH THOMPSON,
 FRANCIS E. WALTER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
 WILLIAM LANGER,
 JAMES O. EASTLAND,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to House Concurrent Resolution 29, favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The amendments of the Senate would have deleted from this resolution 27 names of displaced persons where the Senate believed that such persons, although their applications were forwarded to the Congress by the Attorney General with his favorable recommendation, were not possessed of sufficiently strong equities which would warrant the granting of the status of permanent residence.

The conferees have carefully gone over the records of such persons as submitted by the Attorney General and have agreed, upon reconsideration of the merits involved in each individual case, to reinstate eleven names while deciding to sustain action taken by the Senate in sixteen cases, and to expedite action on three cases.

The conferees are now fully satisfied that they can recommend for approval the list of names contained in the accompanying conference report.

In order to facilitate the task of the administrative agencies which, upon passage of this resolution, will have to create records of admission for permanent residence for every one of the aliens whose names appear on House Concurrent Resolution 29 in its final version, the conferees have decided to incorporate in the conference report the entire list of aliens whose records of entry would be affected by this measure.

LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
 RUTH THOMPSON,
 FRANCIS E. WALTER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 29.

Mr. WALTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I inquire when I may make a point of order against the conference report?

The SPEAKER. Following the reading of the conference report.

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is this the bill that was on the private calendar last week?

The SPEAKER. This is a concurrent resolution that passed the House some time ago. It is not the matter to which the gentleman refers.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the conference report.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the conference report that the report contains names that were not in disagreement and deletes some of the names that were in agreement, so that there was nothing before the conference to change in these instances.

Mr. GRAHAM. I concede the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair notes that the Senate adopted 30 amendments to this House concurrent resolution, but a large part of the resolution, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] states, has not been amended. The

conference report proposes action on all of the concurrent resolution following the resolving clause, thus including portions which are not in disagreement. The conferees obviously have exceeded their jurisdiction, and the point of order is sustained.

The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, strike out line 1.

Page 4, line 20, strike out "Swoyski" and insert "Swojsik."

Page 4, line 21, strike out "Svojski" and insert "Svojsik."

Page 4, strike out line 23.

Page 8, strike out line 2.

Page 11, strike out line 2.

Page 14, strike out lines 7 and 8.

Page 18, strike out line 10.

Page 18, strike out line 12.

Page 18, strike out line 14.

Page 18, strike out line 22.

Page 18, strike out line 23.

Page 19, strike out line 8.

Page 20, strike out line 4.

Page 20, strike out lines 12, 13, and 14.

Page 20, strike out lines 22 and 23.

Page 21, strike out line 17.

Page 22, strike out line 4.

Page 22, strike out line 5.

Page 22, line 6, strike out "Shalmon" and insert "Shalom."

Page 22, strike out line 10.

Page 22, strike out line 14.

Page 22, strike out lines 18 and 19.

Page 22, strike out line 20.

Page 23, strike out line 11.

Page 23, strike out line 12.

Page 23, strike out line 17.

Page 23, strike out line 18.

Page 23, strike out line 24.

Page 24, strike out line 1.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WHEAT FOR PAKISTAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 171)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The people of Pakistan are faced with famine, and they have asked our help in meeting disaster.

We are fortunate to be in a position to offer help at this time, for we have an abundance of wheat. I strongly believe that we should do so. Accordingly I urge the Congress to make possible the shipment to Pakistan of up to 1 million long tons of United States wheat.

The specter of famine confronts the people of Pakistan at a crucial time in their growth as a young free nation. Unchecked, it could undermine the very democratic principles and institutions to which Pakistan is dedicated.

The crisis is largely a result of a calamity of nature. Pakistan was self-sufficient in food until severe drought,

in 2 successive years, struck the wheat-producing area of west Pakistan.

The wheat consumption of the people of west Pakistan averages less than 12 ounces per day in a diet consisting very largely of this grain. Today Government wheat reserves have fallen to the vanishing point.

The immediate need of Pakistan is to obtain abroad up to 1.5 million long tons of wheat both for consumption and for a small working reserve during the next 11 months. Of this total, the Government of Pakistan expects to be able to obtain about 400,000 tons of wheat with its own and other aid resources. Canada and Australia have both made generous grants for wheat to Pakistan. There is no important source in the free world other than the United States able to furnish additional help.

Pakistan has, therefore, appealed to the United States for 1 million tons of wheat. Its approach has been one of dignity, as one sovereign democracy to another, stating a real and urgent need. Between the people of Pakistan and the people of the United States there exists a strong bond of friendship. I am sure that the people of the United States desire their Government to respond rapidly and effectively to Pakistan's request.

Pakistan has endeavored to keep its request for United States aid to a minimum. The Secretary of State and the Director for Mutual Security sent a special mission, headed by Dr. Harry Reed, dean of the College of Agriculture of Purdue University, to study at first hand the food situation in Pakistan. Mr. Dulles and Governor Stassen have also visited Pakistan within the last 2 weeks. With the help of their observations, careful consideration has been given the Reed mission's recommendations.

One critical fact is that the Government of Pakistan is suffering grave financial difficulties. It has already taken rigorous steps to remedy both the food outlook and its general economic disabilities, and these efforts give some hope for future self-sufficiency. But Pakistan's gold and foreign exchange holdings are barely enough to meet its legal requirements for currency backing and essential working capital. Moreover, Pakistan has little prospect of an exportable wheat surplus which would permit repayment of a loan in kind. Its export earnings and all its prospective financial resources are needed to meet the demand of economic development essential to prevent future food and financial crises. A dollar loan would make it impossible for Pakistan to obtain further necessary development loans from international lending institutions.

These considerations make certain conclusions evident. Pakistan needs a grant of up to 700,000 tons of United States wheat for relief purposes according to the best available estimates. The urgency of the need is underscored by the Reed mission's recommendation for delivery of 100,000 tons of United States aid wheat in Karachi by August 15 of this year.

This grant would serve a double purpose. It would meet Pakistan's immediate and pressing need for food and at

the same time provide local currency for economic development programs. The rupee receipts from the sale of wheat would be placed in a counterpart fund under joint Pakistan-United States administration. This fund will be used for development purposes with emphasis placed on increased food production in Pakistan to lessen the danger of future shortages.

In addition to the 700,000 tons, Pakistan may also need up to 300,000 tons as a necessary working reserve of wheat. The exact amount needed for this purpose can only be determined later; and only then can we determine whether the remainder of our aid should be supplied as a grant or a loan.

Fortunately, we do have the capacity to help at the present time. Our large wheat reserves have created a grave storage problem, demanding unusual and sometimes costly storage measures.

I propose, therefore, that the Congress authorize me to make available to Pakistan up to 1 million tons of wheat out of stocks held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. This wheat already is owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, having been obtained under the price-support program. To make it available to Pakistan will create no additional Government expenditure at this time other than the cost of transportation. In order that the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation will not be impaired, I am recommending that the legislation include authority for the Commodity Credit Corporation to recover its costs, including interest, through an appropriation when the costs of the programs have been ascertained.

The United States Government proposes to designate, with the concurrence of the Government of Pakistan, a group to observe the receipt and distribution of wheat in Pakistan. The group's reports will be available to the Congress.

To provide sufficient United States aid in time, it is imperative that the grain begin to move from United States ports by the end of this month.

I strongly urge that the Congress make such prompt action possible.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 10, 1953.

TORNADO DISASTER IN MASSACHUSETTS

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the horrible tornado reached Massachusetts. Great havoc was wrought in Worcester, and I understand in Wrentham, which is in the district of our distinguished Speaker, and other places, including Billerica in my own district. Terrific damage was done to private property and there was great loss of life. I would like to give a report of what the Veterans' Administration hospitals and doctors did for the people who were injured in the Worcester area. In the Framingham and Rutland Heights Veterans' Administration hospitals the disaster program in effect has called all employees back to the hospi-

tals and they were on duty all night. Three additional doctors were sent to the Cushing Hospital.

Three hundred blood donors were assembled at the hospital. One hundred gave transfusions for use in the community, and the other 200 are standing by.

The hospital supplied three ambulances with drivers. Two neurological surgeons were sent to Rutland Heights Hospital. Neither of the Veterans' Administration hospitals was damaged. At Cushing, however, the grounds were littered with debris. At Rutland Heights the communications were put out of commission. Both hospitals are standing by and doing everything they can to help.

All our thanks to them. I believe that the administration will be asked to give help, as it certainly should, to the area damaged in Massachusetts, as well as to the area in Michigan and elsewhere. I shall most certainly support such a resolution.

I plan to leave here as soon as the House adjourns today, to go to Massachusetts to do everything I can to help in the distressed area.

The Boston morning newspapers said that 83 persons were killed, more than 800 injured, and 3,000 were left homeless. The destructive force and effect of the tornado were felt over an area of 40 square miles.

Some idea of the terrible blast can be gathered from the following account which is taken from this morning's Boston Post:

New England's most devastating storm since the great hurricane in 1938, struck in the wake of a series of tornadoes and floods which took at least 149 lives in the Midwest on Monday.

Two hours after the twister had spent itself Red Cross officials said that more than 400 were injured in Worcester, with at least 150 in Worcester hospitals.

In Holden at least 100 houses were destroyed—reduced to matchwood. All communications were broken by the twister. Watermains were out, gas and electric facilities were badly impaired.

Shrewsbury reported more than 100 homes and structures leveled there by the tornado.

Within the Worcester city limits, several houses in a housing project were smashed. One building of the huge Norton Co. machine tool plant was blown down.

Exact figures were lacking at midnight because of the breakdown of normal communications.

Throughout the night rescue workers, teams of Red Cross volunteers, and every available State policeman, national guardsmen, and local police, were digging feverishly into the ruins everywhere, fearful that many persons were buried in the debris of their homes.

BLOWS ITSELF OUT

Only emergency vehicles were being permitted to enter the area at midnight.

All doctors, nurses, and civil defense personnel were mustered by State and local police in the area in the wake of the tornado. The Red Cross announced five disaster relief workers and nursing staffs on their way to the disaster area at midnight.

An early examination of the disaster area showed many houses reduced to kindling, and automobiles, caught in the path of the twister, crumpled as though run over by a giant press.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 16, 1953
For actions of June 15, 1953
83rd-1st, No. 108

CONTENTS

Agr. Adjustment Act.....44	Foreign policy.....8,39	Personnel.....5,14,22,32,43
A.C.P.....1	Forestry.....1	Postal rates.....26
Appropriations	Government economy.....30	Prices, farm.....8
.....1,15,24,27,37,52	Health.....50	Reclamation.....9,16,47
Butter.....28	Housing.....10	Rubber.....46
C.C.C.....3,42	Immigration.....34	Seed.....48
Cotton.....21	Information.....28,54	T.V.A.....15,27
Dairy products.....35	Interest rates.....10	Trade, foreign.....12,33,41,55
Disaster relief.....49	Land laws.....19	Transportation.....17
Electrification.....1,9,38	Lands, transfer.....21	Treaties.....7
Extension Service.....11,36	Livestock.....25	War powers.....6,18
Flood control.....23	Loans, disaster.....51	Weed control.....29
Flood prevention.....1	Lobbying.....20	Wheat.....2,4,40,53
Foreign aid.....2,13,31	Marketing.....1	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed USDA appropriation bill. President approved 3rd supplemental appropriation bill. Senate committee reported bill to transfer surplus wheat to Pakistan. Senate committee reported bill extending mutual security program for 1954, and then referred it to Armed Services Committee. Senate received committee report investigating importation of Canadian feed wheat. Sen. Williams inserted total CCC expenditures and losses since 1933. House completed final congressional action on Extension Service consolidation bill. House passed trade agreements extension bill. House committee ordered reported mutual security bill. Conferees agreed on bill amending leave law. Sen. Welker introduced and discussed bill to prohibit blending of unfit wheat. Rep. Burleson introduced bill authorizing CCC to transfer surplus commodities to MSA. Rep. Dague introduced bill amending Federal Seed Act.

SENATE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954. Passed with amendments this bill, H.R. 5227 (pp. 6679-717). Sens. Young, Ferguson, McCarthy, Mundt, Aiken, Russell, Hayden, and McCarran were appointed conferees (p. 6717).

Agreed to the following amendments in addition to the committee amendments:

By Sen. Thye, to increase the appropriation for the Agricultural Marketing Act (RMA, Title II) from \$5,250,000 to \$5,290,000 to provide for a market news and statistical service for the turkey industry (pp. 6684-5).

By Sen. Watkins, to add an item of \$10,000 for acquisition of land to facilitate control of soil erosion and flood damage in the Cache National Forest, Utah (pp. 6711-12).

Sen. Williams proposed an amendment to make the advance authorization for the Agricultural Conservation Program for the crop year 1954 \$140,000,000, and to reduce the maximum amount of individual payments from \$1,500 to \$1,000. Sen. Russell proposed a substitute amendment to increase the authorization to \$225,000,000. On a 38-36 vote the Senate agreed to substitute the Russell amendment for the Williams amendment. However, the substitute amendment was defeated by a tie vote, 38-38. Sen. Williams then proposed an amendment to make the advance authorization \$145,000,000. This amendment was rejected, 22-51. (pp. 6686-707.)

Rejected the following additional amendments:

By Sen. Monroney, to increase flood prevention from \$7,000,000 to \$12,000,000, the amount of the original budget estimate (pp. 6707-11).

By Sen. Young (on behalf of the committee and under a motion to suspend the rules), to provide that the additional amounts for the rural electrification program may be distributed in any State or Territory, in addition to other sums, except that not over 20% could be distributed to any one State (pp. 6713-14).

2. FOREIGN AID. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendments S. 2112, to provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan (S. Rept. 404) (p. 6657).
The Foreign Relations Committee reported (during recess on June 13), an original bill, S. 2128, extending the mutual security program for 1954 (S. Rept. 403) (p. 6657). This bill was then referred to the Armed Services Committee in order that an examination may be made of the arms features of the bill (p. 6658).
3. CCC OPERATIONS. Sen. Williams inserted the Budget Bureau's letter outlining total CCC expenditures and losses since its inception in 1933 (pp. 6717-8).
4. WHEAT IMPORTS. Received a report on hearings held to date by the Agriculture and Forestry Committee investigating the importation of feed wheat from Canada (S. Rept. 410) (p. 6661).
5. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported with amendments S. 1684, to facilitate civil-service appointment of persons who lost opportunity therefor because of service in the armed forces after June 30, 1950, etc. (S. Rept. 405) (p. 6661).
6. WAR POWERS. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment S. 1237, to extend title 2 of the First War Powers Act (contract authority of the President) through June 30, 1954 (S. Rept. 407) (p. 6661).
7. TREATIES. The Judiciary Committee reported with amendments S. J. Res. 1, which would amend the Constitution to restrict the President's treaty-making power, accompanied by minority and individual views (S. Rept. 412) (p. 6661).
8. FOREIGN POLICY; FARM PRICES. Sen. Wiley inserted his speech made before the Wis. Republican Convention urging support for the Administration's foreign policy and claiming the Administration has given most serious consideration to the problem of declining farm prices (pp. 6672-4).
9. ELECTRIFICATION; RECLAMATION. Sen. Kefauver inserted a letter to the President from 101 signatories representing farm groups and others protesting the Administration's abandonment of the Hells Canyon project and urging the Corps of Engineers, Reclamation Bureau, and USDA to oppose the Idaho Power Company's plan before the FPC to construct smaller dams (pp. 6678-9).
10. HOUSING; INTEREST RATES. As reported (see Digest 106), S. 1993 (1) makes the maximum interest rates for the various mortgage insurance programs under the National Housing Act consistent with each other; (2) revises the maximum interest rate on direct veteran home loans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, so as to conform to the maximum interest rate for guaranteed loans under that act; (3) clarifies the Veterans' Administrator's

WHEAT FOR PAKISTAN

JUNE 13, 1953.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, reported, under authority of the order of June 11 (legislative day, June 8), 1953, the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 2112]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2112) to provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass with amendments.

S. 2112 would carry out the President's recommendation for the grant of wheat to Pakistan as set out in his message of June 10 (H. Doc. 171, 83d Cong.). Pakistan is a new, democratic nation that is friendly to the United States. It has suffered severe drought in its wheat-producing area for 2 successive years. Despite rigorous steps taken by it to remedy both the food outlook and its general economic disabilities, it is at present facing famine conditions and suffering grave financial difficulties. Its gold and foreign-exchange holdings are barely enough to meet its regular requirements for currency backing and essential working capital. It does not appear likely that it would be able to repay a monetary loan, and such a loan would make it impossible for Pakistan to obtain further necessary development loans from international lending institutions. A loan of wheat repayable in kind is neither feasible nor desirable from the viewpoint of either country. Pakistan's export earnings and all of its prospective financial resources are needed to meet the demand of economic development essential to prevent future food and financial crises.

Its immediate need for wheat from abroad is 1.5 million long tons for consumption and for a small working reserve during the next 11 months. It expects to obtain about 400,000 tons from abroad with its own and other aid resources. Canada and Australia have both made generous grants. Under S. 2112 the President could grant Pakistan up to 1 million long tons of wheat, of which 700,000 tons would be

available to alleviate starvation and suffering, and up to 300,000 tons would be available to provide a working reserve. One hundred thousand tons is needed in Karachi by August 15, and immediate action on the bill might tend to have the further beneficial effect of freeing for distribution the little wheat now held in private hands in Pakistan.

As amended by your committee, the bill provides for sale of the wheat by the Government of Pakistan for rupees to those of its people who can afford to pay, and distribution free of cost to those who cannot. It is also expected that proper precautions will be taken by the President and the Government of Pakistan to assure that none of the wheat will be sold at an excessive price. Rupees received from the sale of the wheat would be utilized as agreed upon by the United States and the Government of Pakistan for the further benefit of the people of Pakistan through programs to increase food production and in other programs in the mutual interest of the United States and Pakistan. Five percent of the rupees so received would be available for local currency requirements of the United States, including administrative and operating expenses in Pakistan in connection with assistance supplied by the United States.

Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of wheat early this month totaled about 310 million bushels. The quantity yet to be acquired under the 1952 program may be in excess of another 100 million bushels. The 1953 crop is expected to total over 1,100 million bushels, and supply and demand conditions in exporting and importing countries appear to be such as to result in decreased demand for dollar wheat. The United States is therefore well able to furnish the 1 million long tons (about 37 million bushels) provided by the bill.

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

Section 1 would authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make up to 1 million long tons of wheat acquired through price-support operations available to the President for transfer to the Government of Pakistan upon such terms as he sees fit.

Section 2 would authorize appropriations to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation.

Section 3 would require the terms of the transfer to Pakistan to provide for—

- (a) distribution of the wheat without discrimination;
- (b) full publicity for United States assistance;
- (c) United States observers;
- (d) utilization of local currency received for the wheat as agreed upon by the United States and Pakistan to increase food production in Pakistan and other projects in the mutual interest of the two countries;
- (e) allocation of 5 percent of the local currency receipts to the United States for its local currency requirements; and
- (f) appropriate measures to reduce and forestall further relief needs.

Section 4 would permit termination of assistance by the President or Congress.

Section 5 makes it clear that the local currency allocated to the United States by the bill would be subject to section 1415 of the

Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1953, or any other applicable provision of law. Section 1415 prohibits the expenditure of foreign credits owed to or owned by the United States Treasury except as provided annually in appropriation acts.

AMENDMENTS

Your committee has recommended three amendments to the bill as introduced. These amendments would (1) provide for transportation of at least 50 percent of the wheat in American ships, (2) remove the requirement of the bill that the antidiscrimination provision of the proposed agreement with Pakistan cover wheat from other sources, and (3) provide specifically for free distribution to needy persons.



83^d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 2112

[Report No. 404]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 10 (legislative day, JUNE 8), 1953

Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. TAFT) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

JUNE 13, 1953

Reported, under the authority of the order of the Senate of June 11 (legislative day, June 8), 1953, by Mr. AIKEN, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in *italic*]

A BILL

To provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the
4 Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed
5 to make available to the President out of wheat stocks
6 acquired through price-support operations not to exceed
7 one million long tons of wheat, during the period ending
8 June 30, 1954, for transfer to the Government of Pakistan
9 upon such terms and conditions as the President determines
10 appropriate, of which seven hundred thousand tons may be
11 made available in order to alleviate starvation and mass suf-

1 fering threatened by famine conditions in Pakistan and not to
2 exceed three hundred thousand tons to provide such reserve
3 supply as he may determine to be a necessary supplement
4 to such emergency assistance. Commodity Credit Corpora-
5 tion shall deliver the wheat on board vessels in United
6 States ports as directed by the President. *At least 50 per*
7 *centum of the gross tonnage of wheat made available under*
8 *this Act and transported from the United States on ocean*
9 *vessels shall be so transported on United States flag vessels*
10 *to the extent practicable and to the extent such vessels are*
11 *available at market rates for United States flag vessels.*

12 SEC. 2. For the purpose of making payments to the
13 Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities disposed of
14 hereunder, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated,
15 out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropri-
16 ated, such sums as are equal to the Corporation's investment
17 in such commodities, including handling costs, plus the costs
18 incurred in making deliveries hereunder. Any funds or other
19 assets available to the Commodity Credit Corporation may be
20 used, in advance of such appropriation or payments, for
21 carrying out the purposes of this Act.

22 SEC. 3. No assistance under authority of this Act shall
23 be made available until an agreement is entered into between
24 Pakistan and the United States containing the following
25 undertakings, and any others the President may determine to

1 be desirable to carry out the purposes of this Act, on the part
2 of Pakistan :

3 (a) To distribute the supplies made available under this
4 Act, ~~as well as similar supplies obtained locally or imported~~
5 ~~from outside sources by the Government of Pakistan,~~ among
6 the people of Pakistan without discrimination.

7 (b) To give full and continuous publicity in Pakistan
8 to the assistance furnished by the United States; *and to*
9 *provide such supplies free of cost to persons who, by virtue*
10 *of circumstances beyond their control are unable to pay for*
11 *them.*

12 (c) To permit persons designated by the Government
13 of the United States to observe without restriction the distri-
14 bution in Pakistan of supplies made available under authority
15 of this Act.

16 (d) To deposit in a special account amounts of the cur-
17 rency of Pakistan equivalent to the amounts of such cur-
18 rency accruing to the Government of Pakistan from the im-
19 port and sale of commodities furnished as a grant hereunder,
20 this account to be utilized as may be agreed upon by the
21 United States and the Government of Pakistan for the bene-
22 fit of the people of Pakistan in programs to increase food
23 production and in other projects and programs in the mutual
24 interest of the United States and Pakistan.

25 (e) To allocate to the use of the Government of the

1 United States 5 per centum of the local currency account
2 established in subsection (d) for use, in accordance with
3 applicable United States laws, for local currency require-
4 ments of the United States, including administrative and
5 operating expenses in Pakistan in connection with assistance
6 supplied by the United States.

7 (f) To pursue all appropriate measures to reduce its
8 relief needs and to increase production and supply and im-
9 prove distribution of foodstuffs within Pakistan so as to
10 lessen the danger of similar emergencies in the future.

11 SEC. 4. All or any part of the assistance provided here-
12 under shall be terminated by the President whenever he, or
13 Congress by concurrent resolution, determines that because
14 of changed conditions continuation of assistance is unneces-
15 sary or undesirable. Termination of assistance to Pakistan
16 under this section may include the termination of deliveries
17 of all supplies scheduled under this Act and not yet delivered,

18 SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this Act shall affect the
19 applicability of section 1415 of the Supplemental Appro-
20 priation Act, 1953 or other provisions of law to the local
21 currency allocated to the use of the United States in ac-
22 cordance with the agreement provided for in section 3.

83d CONGRESS
1st Session

S. 2112

[Report No. 404]

A BILL

To provide for the transfer of price-support
wheat to Pakistan.

By Mr. AIKEN, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. SMITH of
New Jersey, and Mr. TAFT

JUNE 10 (legislative day, JUNE 8), 1953

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

JUNE 13, 1953

Reported with amendments

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 17, 1953
For actions of June 16, 1953
83rd-1st, No. 109

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....12	Immigration.....11	Research.....25
Appropriations.....3,5	Land laws.....24	Small business.....23
Disaster relief.....15	Legislative program.....12	St. Lawrence waterway....10
Economic controls.....2,22	Personnel.....7,14,19	Surplus foods.....16
Farm development.....13	Potatoes.....18	T.V.A.....3
Food inspection.....6	Prices, farm.....8	Transportation.....21
Foreign aid.....1,9	Puerto Rico.....20	Wheat.....1,9
Forestry.....4	Reclamation.....5,17	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed Pakistan wheat bill. Senate committee reported St. Lawrence waterway bill. House debated 2nd independent offices appropriation bill. House committees reported wheat-for-Pakistan and mutual security bills. Conferees reported economic controls bill.

HOUSE

1. **FOREIGN AID.** The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H.R. 5659, to provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan (H. Rept. 570) (p. 6906).

The Foreign Affairs Committee reported without amendment H.R. 5710, Mutual Security Agency authorization bill (H. Rept. 569) (p. 6906). Reps. Burleson and Javits discussed this bill (pp. 6851-53).

2. **ECONOMIC CONTROLS.** Received the conference report on S. 1081, providing for temporary economic controls (H. Rept. 571) (pp. 6901-06). The conferees agreed to eliminate from the bill titles 6 (consumer and real-estate credit) and 8 (90-day freeze provisions); adopt the Senate definition of national defense; adopt the House amendment to establish a Small Business Administration (to take the place of the Small Defense Plant Administration which will expire June 30, 1953); and adopt a 2-year extension of those provisions which the House amendment would have extended for only 1 year.

3. **APPROPRIATIONS.** Began debate on H.R. 5690, second independent offices appropriation bill for 1954 (pp. 6850, 6862-901). The discussion centered mainly on TVA.

4. **FORESTRY.** The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) with amendments H.R. 334, regarding disposition of deposits of sand, stone, gravel, etc., when situated on national forest lands (p. D564).

5. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) with amendments H.R. 1374, relating to appropriations for construction of the Eklutna project, Alaska (p. D564).
6. FOOD INSPECTION. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H.R. 5740, to permit factory, warehouse, etc., inspection by the Food and Drug Administration, after giving written notice to the owner (p. D565).
7. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H.R. 5706, to facilitate civil-service appointment of persons who lost this opportunity because of military service after June 30, 1950 (p. D565).
8. FARM PRICES. Rep. McCarthy criticized the statement by Leonard Hall, Republican national chairman, that the farm price decline had been halted by the present administration and that farm prices were now on the upturn (p. 6852).

SENATE

9. FOREIGN AID. Passed with amendments S. 2112 (pp. 6824-31). This bill provides as follows:

Authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation to make up to 1 million long tons of wheat acquired through price-support operations available to the President for transfer to the Government of Pakistan upon such terms as he sees fit. Authorizes appropriations to reimburse CCC. Requires the terms of the transfer to Pakistan to provide for (a) distribution of the wheat without discrimination; (b) full publicity for United States assistance; (c) United States observers; (d) utilization of local currency received for the wheat as agreed upon by the United States and Pakistan to increase food production in Pakistan and other projects in the mutual interest of the two countries; (e) allocation of 5 percent of the local currency receipts to the United States for its local currency requirements; (f) appropriate measures to reduce and forestall further relief needs; and (g) free distribution to needy persons. Permits termination of assistance by the President or Congress. Requires transportation of at least half of the wheat in American ships.
10. ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY. The Foreign Relations Committee reported without amendment S. 2150, to create the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation. Sen. Wiley stated this bill was approved by a 13-2 committee vote. The committee was granted authority to submit its report within the next 2 days (S. Rept. 441). (pp. 6820-1.)
11. IMMIGRATION. Passed without amendment S. 1766, to establish the Office of Commissioner of Refugees to coordinate Government activities relating to escapees and refugees and the migration of persons (pp. 6834-5).
12. RECESSED until Thurs., June 18 (p. 6849). The legislative program as stated by the acting majority leader: S. 1901, outer Continental Shelf bill was made the unfinished business until copies of the hearings and report are available; Thurs., calendar; Fri., if hearings on S. 1901 are not then available, "miscellaneous and largely uncontroversial bills" (pp. 6847-8).

WHEAT FOR PAKISTAN

JUNE 16, 1953.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. HOPE, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 5659]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5659) to provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

Page 2, line 23, amend subsection (a) to read:

(a) To distribute the supplies made available under this Act among the people of Pakistan without discrimination; and to provide such supplies free of cost to persons who, by virtue of circumstances beyond their control, are unable to pay for them.

Page 3, line 4, after the words "furnished by the" insert the words "people of the".

STATEMENT

For the past 2 years the nation of Pakistan has been stricken by a drought which has seriously reduced the production of wheat, the food which makes up approximately two-thirds of the diet of the people of that country. Pakistan is a new, democratic nation that has demonstrated repeatedly its friendship for the United States. The appeal of that nation for a grant of wheat with which to meet the threatened famine conditions in Pakistan was presented to the United States on April 22, 1953, and on June 10, 1953, the President transmitted to the Congress a request for legislation authorizing the gift of such wheat. Pursuant to that request, three identical bills were introduced, H. R. 5659 by Mr. Hope, H. R. 5660 by Mr. Javits, and H. R. 5661 by Mr. Judd. Hearings were held on June 15 and 16, and the committee reports herewith H. R. 5659.

The purpose of this bill is to authorize and direct the Commodity Credit Corporation to make available to the President up to 1 million

long tons of wheat (approximately 37 million bushels) to be transferred to the Government of Pakistan in order to alleviate starvation and famine conditions in Pakistan and to provide that country with some reserve supply of this important food grain. The wheat will come from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation acquired pursuant to price-support operations. These stocks totaled about 310 million bushels on June 1, 1953.

The bill as amended by the committee provides that no wheat shall be transferred to Pakistan until the United States and Pakistan have entered into an agreement as to its use and distribution. This agreement is to include the following provisions:

(1) Distribution of the wheat without discrimination among the people of Pakistan and without cost to those who, through no fault of their own, are unable to purchase it;

(2) Full publicity to the assistance furnished by the people of the United States;

(3) Unrestricted observation of the distribution procedure by United States observers;

(4) Utilization of any local currency derived by Pakistan from the sale of donated wheat, in a manner agreed upon by the United States and the Government of Pakistan, for programs to increase food production in Pakistan and other projects of mutual interest to the two countries;

(5) Allocation of 5 percent of the local currency received for the use of the United States within Pakistan; and

(6) The taking of all appropriate measures to reduce and prevent further relief needs.

The bill also authorizes an appropriation for the purpose of making payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation for the wheat made available to Pakistan. The Corporation, however, is authorized to make the wheat available in advance of receiving payment therefor. Until the appropriation is made to the Corporation, however, it is contemplated that the amount of the payment to be received from the appropriation would be reflected on the books of the Corporation as a receivable. The amount of this receivable would be the Corporation's investment in the wheat, including all handling costs and all costs incurred in making delivery of the wheat on board vessels in United States ports. It is also contemplated that the Corporation's investment and costs would include interest on the total amount thereof to the date of payment to the Corporation, at the rate at which the Corporation borrows from the Treasury in financing its operation.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION

The Secretary of State and the Director of the Mutual Security Agency, both of whom have visited Pakistan recently, appeared before the committee and strongly urged enactment of the bill. Similar endorsement was given by Dr. Harry Reed, dean of the College of Agriculture of Purdue University, who headed a mission to Pakistan to investigate the food situation in that country and who reported to the committee in detail on the conclusions reached by his group.

The bill was transmitted to the Congress on June 10, 1953, by the President, and his Executive communication stating the situation in Pakistan and the need for the legislation is quoted herewith and made a part of this report.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
June 10, 1953.

To the Congress of the United States:

The people of Pakistan are faced with famine, and they have asked our help in meeting disaster.

We are fortunate to be in a position to offer help at this time, for we have an abundance of wheat. I strongly believe that we should do so. Accordingly, I urge the Congress to make possible the shipment to Pakistan of up to 1 million long tons of United States wheat.

The specter of famine confronts the people of Pakistan at a crucial time in their growth as a young free nation. Unchecked, it could undermine the very democratic principles and institutions to which Pakistan is dedicated.

The crisis is largely a result of a calamity of nature. Pakistan was self-sufficient in food until severe drought, in 2 successive years, struck the wheat-producing area of West Pakistan.

The wheat consumption of the people of West Pakistan averages less than 12 ounces per day in a diet consisting very largely of this grain. Today, Government wheat reserves have fallen to the vanishing point.

The immediate need of Pakistan is to obtain abroad up to 1.5 million long tons of wheat both for consumption and for a small working reserve during the next 11 months. Of this total, the Government of Pakistan expects to be able to obtain about 400,000 tons of wheat with its own and other aid resources. Canada and Australia have both made generous grants for wheat to Pakistan. There is no important source in the free world other than the United States able to furnish additional help.

Pakistan has, therefore, appealed to the United States for 1 million tons of wheat. Its approach has been one of dignity—as one sovereign democracy to another—stating a real and urgent need. Between the people of Pakistan and the people of the United States, there exists a strong bond of friendship. I am sure that the people of the United States desire their Government to respond rapidly and effectively to Pakistan's request.

Pakistan has endeavored to keep its request for United States aid to a minimum. The Secretary of State and the Director for Mutual Security sent a special mission, headed by Dr. Harry Reed, dean of the College of Agriculture of Purdue University, to study at first hand the food situation in Pakistan. Mr. Dulles and Governor Stassen have also visited Pakistan within the last 2 weeks. With the help of their observations, careful consideration has been given the Reed mission's recommendations.

One critical fact is that the Government of Pakistan is suffering grave financial difficulties. It has already taken rigorous steps to remedy both the food outlook and its general economic disabilities, and these efforts give some hope for future self-sufficiency. But Pakistan's gold and foreign-exchange holdings are barely enough to meet its legal requirements for currency backing and essential working capital. Moreover, Pakistan has little prospect of an exportable wheat surplus which would permit repayment of a loan in kind. Its export earnings and all its prospective financial resources are needed to meet the demand of economic development essential to prevent future food and financial crises. A dollar loan would make it impossible for Pakistan to obtain further necessary development loans from international lending institutions.

These considerations make certain conclusions evident. Pakistan needs a grant of up to 700,000 tons of United States wheat for relief purposes according to the best available estimates. The urgency of the need is underscored by the Reed mission's recommendation for delivery of 100,000 tons of United States aid wheat in Karachi by August 15 of this year.

This grant would serve a double purpose. It would meet Pakistan's immediate and pressing need for food and at the same time provide local currency for economic development programs. The rupee receipts from the sale of wheat would be placed in a counterpart fund under joint Pakistan-United States administration. This fund will be used for development purposes with emphasis placed on increased food production in Pakistan to lessen the danger of future shortages.

In addition to the 700,000 tons, Pakistan may also need up to 300,000 tons as a necessary working reserve of wheat. The exact amount needed for this purpose can only be determined later; and only then can we determine whether the remainder of our aid should be supplied as a grant or a loan.

Fortunately, we do have the capacity to help at the present time. Our large wheat reserves have created a grave storage problem, demanding unusual and sometimes costly storage measures.

I propose, therefore, that the Congress authorize me to make available to Pakistan up to 1 million tons of wheat out of stocks held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. This wheat already is owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, having been obtained under the price-support program. To make it available to Pakistan will create no additional Government expenditure at this time other than the cost of transportation. In order that the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation will not be impaired, I am recommending that the legislation include authority for the Commodity Credit Corporation to recover its costs, including interest, through an appropriation when the costs of the program have been ascertained.

The United States Government proposes to designate, with the concurrence of the Government of Pakistan, a group to observe the receipt and distribution of wheat in Pakistan. The group's reports will be available to the Congress.

To provide sufficient United States aid in time, it is imperative that the grain begin to move from United States ports by the end of this month.

I strongly urge that the Congress make such prompt action possible.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.



83D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5659

[Report No. 570]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 10, 1953

Mr. HORE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

JUNE 16, 1953

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the
4 Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to
5 make available to the President out of wheat stocks acquired
6 through price-support operations not to exceed one million
7 long tons of wheat, during the period ending June 30, 1954,
8 for transfer to the Government of Pakistan upon such terms
9 and conditions as the President determines appropriate, of
10 which seven hundred thousand tons may be made available
11 in order to alleviate starvation and mass suffering threatened

1 by famine conditions in Pakistan and not to exceed three
2 hundred thousand tons to provide such reserve supply as he
3 may determine to be a necessary supplement to such emer-
4 gency assistance. Commodity Credit Corporation shall de-
5 liver the wheat on board vessels in United States ports as
6 directed by the President.

7 SEC. 2. For the purpose of making payment to the
8 Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities disposed of
9 hereunder, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated,
10 out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appro-
11 priated, such sums as are equal to the Corporation's invest-
12 ment in such commodities, including handling costs, plus
13 the costs incurred in making deliveries hereunder. Any
14 funds or other assets available to the Commodity Credit
15 Corporation may be used, in advance of such appropriation
16 or payments, for carrying out the purposes of this Act.

17 SEC. 3. No assistance under authority of this Act shall
18 be made available until an agreement is entered into between
19 Pakistan and the United States containing the following
20 undertakings, and any others the President may determine
21 to be desirable to carry out the purposes of this Act, on the
22 part of Pakistan:

23 (a) To distribute the supplies made available under this
24 Act, as well as similar supplies obtained locally or imported

1 from outside sources by the Government of Pakistan, among
2 the people of Pakistan without ~~discrimination~~ *discrimination*;
3 and to provide such supplies free of cost to persons who, by
4 virtue of circumstances beyond their control, are unable to
5 pay for them.

6 (b) To give full and continuous publicity in Pakistan
7 to the assistance furnished by the *people of the* United States.

8 (c) To permit persons designated by the Government of
9 the United States to observe without restriction the distribu-
10 tion in Pakistan of supplies made available under authority
11 of this Act.

12 (d) To deposit in a special account amounts of the cur-
13 rency of Pakistan equivalent to the amounts of such cur-
14 rency accruing to the Government of Pakistan from the im-
15 port and sale of commodities furnished as a grant hereunder,
16 this account to be utilized as may be agreed upon by the
17 United States and the Government of Pakistan for the benefit
18 of the people of Pakistan in programs to increase food pro-
19 duction and in other projects and programs in the mutual
20 interest of the United States and Pakistan.

21 (e) To allocate to the use of the Government of the
22 United States 5 per centum of the local currency account
23 established in subsection (d) for use, in accordance with
24 applicable United States laws, for local currency require-

1 ments of the United States, including administrative and
2 operating expenses in Pakistan in connection with assistance
3 supplied by the United States.

4 (f) To pursue all appropriate measures to reduce its
5 relief needs and to increase production and supply and im-
6 prove distribution of foodstuffs within Pakistan so as to
7 lessen the danger of similar emergencies in the future.

8 SEC. 4. All or any part of the assistance provided here-
9 under shall be terminated by the President whenever he, or
10 Congress by concurrent resolution, determines that because
11 of changed conditions continuation of assistance is unneces-
12 sary or undesirable. Termination of assistance to Pakistan
13 under this section may include the termination of deliveries
14 of all supplies scheduled under this Act and not yet delivered.

15 SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this Act shall affect the
16 applicability of section 1415 of the Supplemental Appro-
17 priation Act, 1953, or other provisions of law to the local
18 currency allocated to the use of the United States in ac-
19 cordance with the agreement provided for in section 3.

83^d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5659

[Report No. 570]

A BILL

To provide for the transfer of price-support
wheat to Pakistan.

By Mr. HOPE

JUNE 10, 1953

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

JUNE 16, 1953

Reported with amendments, committed to the Com-
mittee of the Whole House on the State of the
Union, and ordered to be printed

doms, it might be well to point out that many readers in American life have spoken out against the efforts of self-appointed thought controllers and modern-day witch hunters. I myself have made many speeches on this subject within the past 2 years. My distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], warned against the present trend, in an address he delivered at Radcliffe College on June 10. Others have condemned the current attacks on our basic freedoms and our constitutional rights.

The unique and distinguishing thing about President Eisenhower's Dartmouth College address is that the current campaign to burn books is at present completely in the control of the Eisenhower administration. All that the State Department has to do is to stop burning books.

My use of the term "book burning" is symbolic of any effort to remove books from libraries. It matters little whether the removal literally takes the form of burning or consists of storing the books in basements and warehouses.

The current book-burning campaign in United States overseas libraries in Germany is especially regrettable because Germany, under the Nazis, had a particular virulent history of book burning. So has Soviet Russia. Book burning in all its forms is a totalitarian device. It is a technique of the worst kind of dictatorship, but it has no place in democracies which cherish the basic ideals of freedom of religion, freedom of thought, and freedom of speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair reminds the Senator from Missouri that the Senate is now operating under the 2-minute rule, and the Senator has exhausted his 2 minutes.

Mr. HENNINGS. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 30 seconds, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Missouri may proceed.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, book burning is the tool of tyranny—the essence of totalitarian doctrine. That it should be part and parcel of a Nazi regime or of a Communist regime is understandable because it is another power device which reinforces the authoritarian control of the State. But that book burning or any other companion form of thought control should be permitted or condoned by our country is more than shocking. It is shameful, and it is un-American to the core.

I hope President Eisenhower's administration will end this medieval exhibitionism with firmness and finality.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial entitled "Mr. Eisenhower at Dartmouth," appearing in the New York Times of yesterday morning, and two editorials from the Washington Post, one entitled "These Books Weren't Burned," the other "Who's Burning Books?"

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 15, 1953]

MR. EISENHOWER AT DARTMOUTH

If it is a suspicious sign for an American citizen to wish to know something about communism, then 33,938,285 citizens who voted for Dwight D. Eisenhower last November are guilty by association. President Eisenhower, a former soldier who knows what courage is, urged it upon the students in his commencement address yesterday at Dartmouth. He urged, among other things, the kind of courage that is required to read the kind of book that some of our would-be censors think is bad for us. He said, in part:

"Don't join the book burners. * * * Don't be afraid to go in your library and read every book * * * that does not offend our own ideas of decency. How will we defeat communism unless we know what it is? * * * We have to fight it with something better. Not try to conceal the thinking of our own people."

This was an informal address, delivered offhand and without the aid of secretaries, Cabinet members, and publicity experts. However, the President's audience could not mistake his meaning nor doubt his sincerity. He was appealing for a vigorous and positive sort of citizenship which would lead young men to fight existing evils in their own country, to love the good in it, to attack ungodly doctrines with the mind and not merely with the emotions. Unless this approach is possible, then Dartmouth and all other institutions of learning, in spite of those that love them, might as well close their doors. The President had faith that this was not so. He had faith in the inquiring and open mind.

This faith the great mass of those who voted last year for Adlai E. Stevenson undoubtedly share. It is an American faith. The book burners, the exalters of ignorance, the censors and bullies, are, after all, an un-American minority.

[From the Washington Post of June 14, 1953]

THESE BOOKS WEREN'T BURNED

Another indication of the extent to which some Americans have departed from the fundamental beliefs on which this country grew and prospered now has come from San Antonio, where the mayor recently suggested the branding of all "Communist-written" books in the public library. Not to be outdone, the acting city manager said, "I think they should be burned instead of stamped." These un-American suggestions were made after a super-alert lady produced a list of books she considered subversive and which she wanted the library to label in one way or another. On her list were books by Albert Einstein, Thomas Mann, and a few similarly dangerous characters. Also listed were editions of the Canterbury Tales and Moby Dick because the illustrations were by someone she thought to be subversive.

Miss Julia Grothaus, public library director, replied to these fantastic suggestions as a responsible librarian should. The San Antonio Library, she said, "does have books on communism * * * some by suspected or known Communists. These books are carefully chosen so that the reader may learn all that he should know about communism * * *. After all you cannot remain ignorant about a thing and fight it. The library always has carried books on controversial subjects * * *. The library never has dictated to the people what they should read * * *. It has material on both sides of the question. These books are not labeled, but catalogued."

The library board has stood firmly behind the librarian despite some popular support at first for the mayor and acting city manager. The mayor listed opponents of his book-branding scheme as just "the intelligentsia." But the mayor has been ever so

quiet in the last few days and the controversy has died down. The acting city manager, for reasons which have not been made clear, has resigned. All in all, San Antonians seem to have withstood this assault upon their dignity as intelligent citizens should. But the fact that an issue like this can even be seriously debated is a disturbing symptom of the hysteria abroad in the land.

[From the Washington Post of June 16, 1953]

WHO'S BURNING BOOKS?

President Eisenhower's outspoken remarks at Dartmouth ought to have been read by his Secretary of State as a mandate to end the chaotic and demoralizing situation that has developed in American overseas libraries. The responsibility to stop the "book burners," as the President described those who would impose a censorship or book purge, rests squarely on the Secretary of State. Yet at his press conference yesterday Mr. Dulles misinterpreted the spirit of the President's statement and made it clear that he simply wanted to slough off his own responsibility.

But American foreign policy is being undermined by the heavy-handed attacks on the integrity of the libraries. At a time when Russia is wooing Western Germany with an unprecedented show of finesse, the United States is seemingly determined to offend all its most loyal friends, in Germany as well as elsewhere. That the State Department should be a party to the attack is incredible. Yet by its surrender to a potent minority on Capitol Hill that has no understanding of the American heritage the Department has abetted the country's most violent defamers.

Whatever the demerits of a given volume, the moment officials start weeding out books because the authors of the books are under attack American freedom is made to appear ridiculous. It has been the habit of free countries to judge a book by its content, not by the name or politics of the author. When American officials purge United States libraries that are supposed to be symbols of freedom, it is no wonder that foreigners ask whether this country is going Fascist. The question may seem to us to be irrelevant and irreverent, but the memory of fascism is keen in Europe, and Europeans know that book burning marked the beginning of fascism in Italy and Germany. A copy of a Communist book in an American overseas library could do very little harm; the withdrawal of that book, with the attendant publicity, can do this country infinite harm.

In a report the other day from Berlin to the New York Times, Walter Sullivan gave a terrifying account of the effect on the German mind of the book purges. Some books written by indubitably loyal and middle-of-the-road Americans have been removed from the library shelves. Some others by persons who are under attack as leftwingers have been removed. From Italy recently came a report that a book by Secretary Dulles was withdrawn. Such is the absurdity of this kind of censorship. It cannot be limited or intelligently handled. Once it is started, there is no stopping. Almost every book published contains something that is objectionable to someone or some group.

Mr. Sullivan said in his report that the book purges and some other censorial activities "have done much to undo the herculean efforts of United States occupation forces in the postwar years to present American democracy to the German people as a magnet to draw them away from totalitarian attitudes." The British and French information services, he said, continue to present to the Germans a broad section of opinion from their own countries. In his final report as High Commissioner, John J. McCloy said that one of the basic tasks of the American

libraries was to combat the intellectual stagnation of the Nazi period and the effect of 12 years "of isolation and one-sided information." We cannot counteract the effects of German book burning by similar tactics of our own.

A most important thing for Europeans to remember is that these desecrations have been committed by terrorized officials in the face of serious objection and criticism from many Americans. A vast number of persons here are appalled by what has taken place. Our European friends should not lose sight of the fundamental sanity of the great majority of Americans and the great strength of our constitutional safeguards. But the President chose a propitious moment to reassert a basic American conviction in the spirit of freedom, and others in the administration ought to take the cue.

TRANSFER OF PRICE-SUPPORT WHEAT TO PAKISTAN

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2112) to provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment of the committee will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 2, in line 6, after the word "President" to insert "At least 50 per centum of the gross tonnage of wheat made available under this act and transported from the United States on ocean vessels shall be so transported on United States flag vessels to the extent practicable and to the extent such vessels are available at market rates for United States flag vessels."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 3, in line 4, after the word "Act", to strike out the comma and "as well as similar supplies obtained locally or imported from outside sources by the Government of Pakistan."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 3, in line 8, after the word "States", to insert a semicolon and "and to provide such supplies free of cost to persons who, by virtue of circumstances beyond their control are unable to pay for them."

MR. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to point out that, by mistake, the amendment was printed at the point indicated in the bill, whereas it would be more appropriate and accurate if it were inserted after the word "discrimination", in line 6, at the end of paragraph (a). The amendment will mean the same, wherever it appears in the bill.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be transposed accordingly.

Does the Senator from Vermont believe it is necessary that a comma be inserted after the word "control", in line 10?

MR. AIKEN. I think a comma should be inserted there.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, a comma will be inserted accordingly.

Without objection, the committee amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment. **MR. KNOWLAND.** Mr. President, let me suggest to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that it might be well to have the committee report, which is rather short, appear in the RECORD immediately preceding the final action on the bill, so that the legislative background of the bill will be available.

MR. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report (No. 404) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2112) to provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass with amendments.

S. 2112 would carry out the President's recommendation for the grant of wheat to Pakistan as set out in his message of June 10 (H. Doc. 171, 83d Cong.). Pakistan is a new, democratic nation that is friendly to the United States. It has suffered severe drought in its wheat-producing area for 2 successive years. Despite rigorous steps taken by it to remedy both the food outlook and its general economic disabilities, it is at present facing famine conditions and suffering grave financial difficulties. Its gold and foreign-exchange holdings are barely enough to meet its regular requirements for currency backing and essential working capital. It does not appear likely that it would be able to repay a monetary loan, and such a loan would make it impossible for Pakistan to obtain further necessary development loans from international lending institutions. A loan of wheat repayable in kind is neither feasible nor desirable from the viewpoint of either country. Pakistan's export earnings and all of its prospective financial resources are needed to meet the demand of economic development essential to prevent future food and financial crises.

Its immediate need for wheat from abroad is 1.5 million long tons for consumption and for a small working reserve during the next 11 months. It expects to obtain about 400,000 tons from abroad with its own and other aid resources. Canada and Australia have both made generous grants. Under S. 2112 the President could grant Pakistan up to 1 million long tons of wheat, of which 700,000 tons would be available to alleviate starvation and suffering, and up to 300,000 tons would be available to provide a working reserve. One hundred thousand tons is needed in Karachi by August 15, and immediate action on the bill might tend to have the further beneficial effect of freeing for distribution the little wheat now held in private hands in Pakistan.

As amended by your committee, the bill provides for sale of the wheat by the Government of Pakistan for rupees to those of its people who can afford to pay, and distribution free of cost to those who cannot. It is also expected that proper precautions will be taken by the President and the Government of Pakistan to assure that none of the wheat will be sold at an excessive price. Rupees received from the sale of the wheat would be utilized as agreed upon by the United States and the Government of Pakistan for the further benefit of the people of Pakistan through programs to increase food production and in other programs in the mutual interest of the United States and Pakistan. Five percent of the rupees so received would be available for local currency requirements of the United States, including administrative and operating ex-

penses in Pakistan in connection with assistance supplied by the United States.

Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of wheat early this month totaled about 310 million bushels. The quantity yet to be acquired under the 1952 program may be in excess of another 100 million bushels. The 1953 crop is expected to total over 1,100 million bushels, and supply and demand conditions in exporting and importing countries appear to be such as to result in decreased demand for dollar wheat. The United States is therefore well able to furnish the 1 million long tons (about 37 million bushels) provided by the bill.

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

Section 1 would authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make up to 1 million long tons of wheat acquired through price-support operations available to the President for transfer to the Government of Pakistan upon such terms as he sees fit.

Section 2 would authorize appropriations to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation.

Section 3 would require the terms of the transfer to Pakistan to provide for—

(a) distribution of the wheat without discrimination;

(b) full publicity for United States assistance;

(c) United States observers;

(d) utilization of local currency received for the wheat as agreed upon by the United States and Pakistan to increase food production in Pakistan and other projects in the mutual interest of the two countries;

(e) allocation of 5 percent of the local currency receipts to the United States for its local currency requirements; and

(f) appropriate measures to reduce and forestall further relief needs.

Section 4 would permit termination of assistance by the President or Congress.

Section 5 makes it clear that the local currency allocated to the United States by the bill would be subject to section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1953, or any other applicable provision of law. Section 1415 prohibits the expenditure of foreign credits owed to or owned by the United States Treasury except as provided annually in appropriation acts.

AMENDMENTS

Your committee has recommended three amendments to the bill as introduced. These amendments would (1) provide for transportation of at least 50 percent of the wheat in American ships, (2) remove the requirement of the bill that the antidiscrimination provision of the proposed agreement with Pakistan cover wheat from other sources, and (3) provide specifically for free distribution to needy persons.

MR. AIKEN. Mr. President, I had a brief speech prepared in connection with the bill. However, if there is no objection at all to the bill, I much prefer not to give the speech.

MR. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

MR. AIKEN. I yield.

MR. CARLSON. I certainly do not wish to delay action on the bill. Let me say that I wrote to Harold Stassen, Director of Mutual Security, about 3 weeks ago, regarding the use of some of the price-support, surplus wheat in the form of flour for food. Inasmuch as I have received a letter from Mr. Stassen, I now ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR FOR
MUTUAL SECURITY,
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1953.
The Honorable FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: Thank you very much for your letter of June 1.

I am very gratified to hear that you are prepared to give affirmative support to the President's request for wheat to meet the emergency situation in Pakistan. Any assistance you can give us in expediting the passage of the necessary legislation for this program will be deeply appreciated.

We have carefully considered your proposal that a portion of the shipments to Pakistan be in the form of flour, in order that it may be ready for immediate use on arrival. I am informed, however, that in this particular country, the furnishing of flour might complicate, rather than expedite the process of getting the food into the places where it is most needed. The whole ration and distribution system of Pakistan is based on grain, and past experience has indicated that considerable administrative difficulties would be involved if flour were introduced directly into the system. A major element in the situation is the fact that the Pakistani traditionally mill and cook grain in their homes. The result of this process is a 95-percent extraction rate, and naturally a very coarse flour. We are continuing our study of the possibility of using flour in this type of situation, but I don't believe that in the present case of Pakistan, we would be gaining any time or advantage through a substitution of it for the wheat itself.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD E. STASSEN,
Director for Mutual Security.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Vermont should give the speech he has prepared, for the benefit of the people of the country.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, let me say that this bill is the result of President Eisenhower's request to Congress of last Wednesday that 1 million tons of wheat be made available to Pakistan.

Pakistan has had 2 years of drought, and is very short of wheat. Thus we have an opportunity to have our own country, which has a very large surplus of wheat, make a friendly gesture toward one of the countries of the world which is in need and which is also friendly to us.

The wheat which it is proposed to send to Pakistan will be sold at a fixed price by the Government of Pakistan, except that which is used to help the people who have no rupees to pay for it. The money received for the wheat will be spent by the Mutual Security Administration in helping to build and repair irrigation works in Pakistan, in the hope that it will prevent the recurrence of near-famine conditions. I do not know that there is anything more to be said, unless there are questions.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The bill provides for the establishment of a special fund in which the Government of Pakistan will deposit in the form of its own local currency the money received in the disposition of the wheat. Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. That is entirely correct. The people of Pakistan are not out of

funds, but they are out of dollars. They have rupees, but unfortunately the rupees will not buy United States and Canadian wheat.

Mr. CASE. Ninety-five percent of those funds will be available for expenditure within Pakistan, for the improvement of the food-producing ability of the country. Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. My reason for bringing out that point is that for some time there has been pending before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which the Senator from Vermont is chairman, a bill which I introduced many weeks ago, proposing a program somewhat similar to this, but for the benefit of the people and the armed forces of the Republic of South Korea. The principle underlying the pending proposal seems to me to be worthy of application to other situations, not only from the humanitarian standpoint, but also that the interests of the United States itself may be served.

When General Van Fleet appeared before the Committee on Armed Services, he spoke at some length of the relative ration of food given to the South Koreans who were in their armed forces, and the ration which was provided for the prisoners of war. He stated repeatedly that the South Korean soldiers who were guarding the prisoners of war were receiving much less in the way of food rations than were those they guarded, the Red soldiers, who were being fed by us under the terms of the Geneva Convention.

It seemed to me, therefore, that we could appropriately make available to the Republic of South Korea foodstuffs and fiber, to be paid for in their own currency. They, too, are out of dollars. We could thereby strengthen the ability of the South Korean soldier to stand in the line and to resist aggression. We also could make the dollars do double duty by making the Korean currency thus paid available for the rehabilitation of Korea.

Everyone knows that we simply cannot walk away from Korea, after it has been devastated by armed conflict, and their public buildings, hospitals, and schools have been destroyed. Sooner or later we shall have to provide some funds for the purpose of rehabilitating Korea. We cannot do less for an ally, Korea, than we have done for such former enemy countries as Japan and Germany. If at the same time we use funds for the purchase of grains, meat, and fiber products to be made available to the South Koreans, we receive in return therefor the local currency and set it aside for the rehabilitation of Korea, we will get double duty from the dollars.

I take this occasion to point that out, because what we are doing for Pakistan is something we ought also to do, it seems to me, for the Republic of South Korea. It would strengthen the ability of the South Koreans to maintain their position, and it would assist in the discharge of the obligation to rehabilitate the country, an obligation which we will recognize when the truce is signed. I should like to urge upon the distinguished chair-

man of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry the importance of early action on that subject.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from South Dakota has aptly pointed out one way by which American food surpluses could be used in the promotion of good will and better economic conditions throughout the world. There are several bills pending which have that general objective in view. However, it is my understanding that the White House expects to send to the Congress very soon, possibly this week, a proposal to authorize the President to use some of our surplus commodities for the purpose of promoting international good will and preventing distress in friendly nations, and at the same time to authorize the disposal of some of our very large surpluses of certain commodities within the United States. I think it likely that the bill will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations for consideration. I have not seen it, but I assure the Senator from South Dakota that, so far as it is possible for the Senator from Vermont to cooperate to that end, an end which he has very fittingly pointed out at this time, he will do so. But I do not feel like stepping in ahead of the President's own proposal, when that proposal is expected to reach Congress soon, possibly within the next day or two.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I may state that following the Van Fleet hearings and my introduction of the bill to which I have referred, I discussed the Korean situation with the Ambassador from the Republic of Korea at considerable length. The information was so important that I asked him to put in writing, in the form of a letter addressed to me, a summary of the statements he had made in our visit. It should be of interest to all Senators. I ask permission of the Senate to have that letter printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KOREAN EMBASSY,
Washington, D. C., March 25, 1953.
The Honorable Senator FRANCIS CASE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: It was a great pleasure for Mr. Han, our counsellor, and me to meet you and your assistant this morning, and I want to thank you for taking time out to talk with us.

Again I wish to repeat what I have written to you and what I have told you—namely, that I am very grateful to you for having given serious thought to the whole problem of relieving our very grave economic needs in Korea.

In compliance with your request, I wish to state the following:

As you well know, this horrible war has been going on for the last 3 years in Korea, and more than 1,000 villages have either been destroyed or seriously crippled. More than 50 cities and towns have met the same fate during the course of the fighting in Korea. Ten million of our people have been made homeless, and there are more than 100,000 innocent children who have become orphans. Bombing from the south, bomb-

ing from the north, bombing from the east, and bombing from above cause a great deal of destruction in Korea, and this explains why most of our agricultural production has been seriously disrupted. Furthermore, there are virtually no facilities for the production of consumer goods.

I am sure that you can understand very readily why we need help. We have to feed these homeless people, we have to clothe them, and particularly the unfortunate orphans must be fed and clothed also.

Naturally, the food problem is one of the most acute difficulties our people face. We have to supply our population and particularly our armed forces, and, despite the fact that many well-meaning non-Korean organizations have been assisting us, the problem still remains serious. That is why whatever you can do in this respect would be a tremendous contribution to the betterment of the general well-being of our people. Grains such as barley, wheat, rice, corn, soya beans, and even flour would be most welcome to us. Any poultry products as well as other meats would be an invaluable addition to the task of meeting the shortage of food in Korea. However, dairy produce such as cheese, butter, and liquid milk would not be suitable, because the Korean dietary habits have not as yet been developed to include a taste for these items. On the other hand, it is my firm belief that powdered milk would be very useful, particularly for the children in Korea.

Any assistance that can be given to relieve the suffering of our people, particularly with regard to the need for food and clothing materials such as woolen and cotton goods, would mean a tremendous uplift in the morale of my countrymen.

I am sure that you will agree with me that, if the families and dependents of our soldiers in Korea as well as the police, who also have shared the burden of fighting in Korea, are given a more ample supply of food and clothing, the morale of our fighting soldiers and police would be greatly strengthened. Such help would make a direct contribution to the even more essential military operations in Korea.

As I told you this morning, due to the poor living conditions, because of the war, 30 percent of our people are tuberculosis cases. If something is not done to alleviate this situation, it may mean national suicide.

You may remember my comment on the farm animals. The losses in virtually all forms of livestock have been very heavy, and there has been a very sharp decline in the number of draft animals for tilling the soil. I am sure that in ameliorating this condition it would mean an increase of agricultural produce in Korea.

I also called to your attention our need for ships. Early in 1952 a bill was introduced by Senator WARREN MAGNUSON to authorize the transfer of 50,000 tons of ships to be used by Korea. This was passed in the Senate, but to our great regret, the bill failed to get recommendation in the House.

In the last few years, kindhearted American people, through their churches, other organizations, and, in many cases, individuals, have collected large quantities of relief goods for our refugees in Korea. May I call to your attention that many times in the past these goods have failed to reach Korea because of the lack of transportation.

If we had, for example, 10 Liberty-type ships, there could be a continuous flow of transportation not only for our relief goods but also for grains that have been purchased now in the process of being sent to Korea. It would mean further that these ships could go to Korean ports directly instead of stopping first in Japan. This would eliminate piling up of goods due to lack of shipping space. Our Government, despite its very difficult financial situation, has been using its meager dollar funds for the purchase of grain in this country and elsewhere

as well as for the transportation of these grains at a cost of up to \$13 per ton. If we had these ships, the cost for transportation could be greatly reduced, and, naturally, this reduction would help us immensely. Ten of these ships could transport 40,000 to 50,000 tons of cargo per month.

The above is about the gist of our conversation this morning, and if there is anything I can do, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Very sincerely yours,

YOU CHAN YANG,
Korean Ambassador.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas, for a question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have several questions I desire to ask.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Arkansas for a series of questions?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that I have had no opportunity to study the pending proposal. I have been fully occupied with appropriation bills. However, from a hurried glance at the bill, there are some questions I should like to ask.

Do I correctly understand that the wheat in question is to be made available to the Government of Pakistan, to in turn be sold to the people of Pakistan?

Mr. AIKEN. The Government of Pakistan will sell the wheat to those who have money with which to pay for it, and will sell it at a fixed price. One of the amendments which the committee proposed, and which has been approved by the Senate, provides that wheat shall be furnished, also, to those who cannot afford to pay for it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is it correct to say that we are actually making a gift of the wheat to the Pakistan Government, itself?

Mr. AIKEN. In the final analysis, yes; although the Government of Pakistan will sell the wheat and put the money in a special fund. The money will then be expended for the improvement of irrigation work in Pakistan, in the hope that future crop failures may be prevented.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is it not true that all the wheat is to be given by our Government for the benefit of Pakistan? So far as we are concerned, we are to receive no payment in money or in other material values in return for the aid and assistance we are giving. Is not that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. We are, however, trying to make certain that the Government of Pakistan will so administer the gift as not to discriminate against those who are suffering from hunger, as a result of their inability to produce or to purchase food; and we will require the Government of Pakistan to make distribution to all who are in need, charging only those who are able to pay. Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. That is the purpose. That is why we adopted the amendment,

"and to provide such supplies free of cost to persons who, by virtue of circumstances beyond their control, are unable to pay for them." I understand, however, that most of the Pakistanians are able to pay, but they are able to pay only in rupees. Nevertheless, there are in Pakistan, as there are in this country, those who are unable to pay.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Payment, of course, would be made in the currency of Pakistan.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That currency would then be used for the purpose of making internal improvements, so as to provide greater production capacity for the future. Is that not correct?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. I may say also that the money received from the sale of the wheat might save the United States some expense to which it would otherwise be put, through the mutual security program.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is it correct that the wheat which we propose to give to Pakistan amounts to about 37 million bushels?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As of today, what is the money value of the wheat?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know the exact cost to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What would it amount to, approximately, in millions of dollars?

Mr. AIKEN. It would be about \$80 million or \$85 million.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, we are making a gift of from \$80 million to \$85 million. Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. I suppose that is not the world-market price, but that is what it would cost us.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, that is what it will cost the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct; that is what it would cost for the wheat.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, the wheat we are giving to Pakistan will cost or has cost the taxpayers of the United States approximately \$80 million or \$85 million. Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. Let me say to the Senator that when transportation charges are added the amount will probably be nearer \$100 million.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That we are granting to the Government of Pakistan?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. All we hope to gain from this action, as I see it, will be two things: We benefit in that we are serving humanity; we are doing something for the relief of human suffering in another area of the world. The second benefit is, though it is not insured, that we will gain the good will and friendship of the people of Pakistan.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. And there is still a third benefit. We have nearly 600 million bushels of wheat carryover, with a prospect of 800 million bushels of carryover a year from now. The Government already owns 310 million bushels of wheat acquired under the price-support program, and it is very likely that it will lose a good deal on the wheat.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Whatever the value may be, the taxpayers have already paid for it or will pay for it. It means approximately \$100 million to them, anyway, whatever we do with the wheat.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The point I am making, Mr. President, is that the only benefit we derive from the transaction is the self-satisfaction of knowing that we are trying to do a humanitarian service for people who are in distress and are suffering, while at the same time we hope, at least, that we shall receive their friendship and good will.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I notice in the report the following statement, about which I should like to have the Senate think for a moment:

The United States is therefore well able to furnish the 1 million long tons (about 37 million bushels) provided by the bill.

Mr. President, we assert that we are well able and can well afford to do this for peoples elsewhere in the world. I am going along with the proposal to make this gift, but I desire now to remind the Senate that at the same time we are depriving our own people of many protections from disaster and suffering by cutting to the bone, below the realities of necessity, and despite the demand and the urgency, appropriations for flood control, for soil conservation, and for other benefits we should be providing here at home.

I have just come from the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. The subcommittee is marking up the Civil Functions bill to provide for flood control and improvements to rivers and harbors. We are trying to cut the appropriation even below the revised budget in order to bring about a nearer balance of the national budget. We make the assertion here in this report that we are well able to furnish this wheat to Pakistan, but, on the other hand, they should know that we are able to do it only while we are denying our own people much protection in the nature of flood control and related improvements for which there is a critical demand and an urgent necessity.

I hope the beneficiaries of this gift will not take for granted the implication of the statement in the committee's report that we are simply overflowing with goods and wealth and that we can disburse it wherever we want to without some sacrifice being made by our people here at home. Too often the erroneous impression has gone to foreign countries that America is rich and she can afford it. Thank God, maybe we can afford it, but I think it is well to let other peoples of the world know that when we do these things we are sacrificing and denying ourselves some things we urgently need here at home. As the distinguished Presiding Officer who is in the chair at the moment is well aware, and as other Senators know, we are making a sacrifice.

Disaster from floods could be prevented, Mr. President, if we should take this \$100 million and devote it to flood control and conservation measures for which there is an urgent need in many of the valleys of our own Nation. I do

not want the unqualified impression to go forth that we are well able to give this wheat and that it means no sacrifice on the part of the American people to do so. It does mean a sacrifice. We are sacrificing in order to do it, and the RECORD should show that fact. When we give assistance of this nature to other governments, we should let them know it is costing us something to do it; that we too have burdens to carry, and we hope they will realize and appreciate the more our willingness to sacrifice in order to help them and bring relief to their suffering people.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arkansas for his remarks, but I want to point out that the United States is well able to furnish the 1 million long tons, approximately 37 million bushels, of wheat provided by the bill. That is not to be interpreted as meaning that the United States has a surplus of money. It means that we have a large surplus of wheat for which the farmers have been paid under our price-support program. I am glad the point has been raised, because I want to make it clear that the committee statement to which the Senator from Arkansas referred does not relate to a surplus of money.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to commend the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] had much to say about the giveaway program. Everyone is familiar with the fact that with the exception of UNRRA I have always voted against giveaway programs. But it has been traditional with the people of the United States that wherever they see hunger, want, or starvation they want to help, and for example, most of you will remember the aid we gave Japan at the time of the earthquake.

With reference to Pakistan, upon the return of our distinguished Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, from his trip abroad 3 weeks ago, he said that nowhere in the East do we have better friends than in Pakistan, and that their splendid military forces are set to help this country at any time we need them. Pakistan has a distinguished Ambassador who has taken a very active part in promoting friendship between the people of the United States and the people of Pakistan. He has rendered distinguished and outstanding service in the cause of humanity.

Mr. President, there are in the State of Texas approximately 25 Pakistan families. Near Phoenix, Ariz., there are 250 Pakistan families. In the home State of the distinguished majority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND], near Sacramento, and in other places in California, there are 1,250 Pakistanians, hundreds more who have made an outstanding record.

They came to this country in about 1908 and 1909. When they went to the Imperial Valley that valley was waste country. In that valley and in other places in California where there was alkali swampland they planted rice.

When they planted it they knew they would not get any crop the first year. They knew they had to inoculate the soil. The next year they got a small crop. They continued their development work in California until the land became worth several hundred dollars an acre. Then out of a clear sky, Mr. President, came a suit claiming that these people from Pakistan were neither Negroes nor Caucasians, and therefore could not become citizens of our country. The Supreme Court of the United States, in 1924 or thereabouts, with Mr. Justice Sutherland writing the opinion, held that they could not own any land in the five States which had passed laws against such ownership. Nor as aliens could they even get driver's licenses for their trucks or cars.

I made a thorough investigation of the matter. I visited Gov. Earl Warren, of California. Mr. Warren wrote a beautiful letter to Dr. Mubarek Ali Khan, head of the India Welfare League of America, and said that the Pakistanis were some of the very finest people who had ever come to the State of California, and that they practically held the record for having committed fewer law violations than any other people.

I contacted the Governor of Arizona, Mr. Osborn, and the attorney general, Mr. Wilson, and they endorsed the bill to enable these 3,500 or 4,000 people an opportunity to become citizens of the United States.

Representatives Clare Boothe Luce and EMANUEL CELLER put in a bill in the House and I introduced one in the Senate, and the bill was finally passed, with the assistance of Dr. Cooper, now deceased, of Catholic University. The committee held that the Pakistanis were Caucasian in view of testimony given by certain anthropologists.

Mr. President, in World War II 250 Pakistan boys offered their lives as members of the United States Armed Forces. I think there ought to be an immigration quota for Pakistan. I suggest to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. WILEY] that when the Senate considers the matter of Near East relief, the subject of a quota for Pakistan be included.

I compliment the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] upon the remarkably fine work he has done. The subcommittee has done much to create good feelings between the Near East, the people of Pakistan and the United States. Heaven knows, we need such good feeling today between the people of that area, above all other places in the world, and the people of this country. I am certain that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who is chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, will remember the testimony of John Foster Dulles that those people are anxious and willing to integrate a part of their forces with and to fight, if necessary, in behalf of the people of the United States of America.

Mr. President, the pending bill represents a forward step, and I am delighted to support it. This measure giving this wheat to the starving people of Pakistan will in a large measure be due to the

untiring, hard 12 years of work of Dr. Murabek Ali Khan, who has sacrificed so much of his time and money for his people and who is beloved all over the United States as a statesman who ardently supported the goal of friendship between these two countries.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, I wish to join with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and other Senators who have expressed commendation of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for reporting the Senate bill 2112, which provides for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan.

I note that the formula in the bill, as set forth in the first two paragraphs, is very much similar to a formula I presented to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations with respect to the overall use of surplus commodities. As the Senator from Vermont will recall, in speaking privately to him about the kind of legislation Congress might pass that would facilitate the improvement of our foreign relations by the use of excess foodstuffs, I expressed the hope that some permanent legislation would be enacted, so that the President would have authority to grant such aid when it was in the interest of the United States. I believe the proposal outlined in the Pakistan wheat bill provides a legislative formula which can be used in connection with the overall picture of the distribution of surplus commodities, because I am certain that the question will arise again.

For a long time I have been interested in emergency food aid to Pakistan. On April 27, 1953, I introduced a bill, Senate bill 1782, which would have almost the same effect as that resulting from the measure now before the Senate. Prior to that I had written to the Secretary of State and to the Mutual Security Administrator, encouraging them to cause an investigation to be made with respect to what amount of such aid might be necessary. I think the record should show that the Government of the United States did send a team of investigators, so to speak, into the area of Pakistan, and that they returned with factual information as to the need for particular allotment of surplus wheat from the Commodity Credit Corporation provided for in the pending measure. So this is a very well planned piece of legislation.

I think it should also be noted when hearings are held on the mutual security bill in the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished chairman of which I am glad to observe present in the Senate Chamber, that one of the areas where some Senator feel funds for economic aid might be too limited is the Far East, as the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has pointed out. Particularly is that true in the case of some of the Moslem countries.

As I understand, the native currency which will be obtained from the sale of this wheat in Pakistan can be and will be used in the general direction of co-

operation by the Mutual Security Administration in the overall, long-term improvement of agricultural conditions in Pakistan. Is not that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Minnesota is correct. The rupees which will be paid for the wheat by those who are able to pay for it, who include most of the people of Pakistan, will be used for permanent improvements, and will reduce proportionately the numbers of dollars which might otherwise have to be sent from the United States under the mutual assistance program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wished to make that clear, because while I realize that the proposal involves a large expenditure on the part of the people of the United States, including expenditures which have already been made for price-supported commodities, actually, as the Senator from Vermont has pointed out, in the long run it may very well replace some dollar expenditures at a later date, because in this instance, as in the case of the India wheat program, which it may be recalled was before the Senate 2 years ago, the money is dedicated to the improvement of land and of irrigation facilities, so that farm conditions may be alleviated. This is to be done in the hope that the United States will not again have to meet such emergency problems.

I assure the Senator from Vermont of my wholehearted support of the bill. I only say, as the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has pointed out, that what is proposed in the case of Pakistan follows a kind of program which, if carefully worked out, can greatly strengthen the foreign relations of the United States. Particularly is this true as we observe the shift in tactics of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is shifting somewhat from the "politics of violence" to the "politics of peace." It appears that our mutual security program ought to be strengthened by giving to the President of the United States and to the Mutual Security Administration authority to utilize some of our surplus foods, first, wherever they can be used to alleviate famine and human suffering, and second, wherever they can be used to strengthen American foreign policy and strengthen the free world.

I hope the Senate will approach the mutual security authorization and appropriation with a view to strengthening the whole mutual security and foreign policy structure, because to date it has been necessary to legislate on these questions individually. I believe Congress ought to legislate on the subject generally, and not make it necessary to enact a law with respect to every specific proposal.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. In order that the record may be clear, there are two questions I wish to ask, since there has been some discussion of the bill.

First, in response to a question asked by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], I think the record will give the impression that all the local currency will become available for the purposes which have been discussed by the Sena-

tor from Minnesota. Is it not correct that the bill provides that 5 percent of the local currency account is to be available for the local currency requirements of the United States within Pakistan?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE. So 95 percent is to be available for the other program, and 5 percent would be available for our own expenses in Pakistan.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. In addition, the committee has an amendment providing that at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of wheat shall be transported "on United States-flag vessels to the extent practicable," as I read the bill, and I simply wish the RECORD to be clear about the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation is not to pay the transportation. The Commodity Credit Corporation is to deliver the wheat on board vessels in United States ports, as directed by the President.

Mr. AIKEN. The Commodity Credit Corporation is not to pay the transportation. I think the Mutual Security Administration is to pay the transportation. It is intended that Pakistan pay the cost of nondollar bottoms as far as possible, and that the dollar bottoms will be paid for out of MSA funds.

Mr. CASE. But the Commodity Credit Corporation does not pay it?

Mr. AIKEN. It is to be paid by whichever agency is designated by the President to handle the wheat. We are told that the President will designate the Mutual Security Agency. The provision that at least 50 percent of the wheat shall be carried in American bottoms, if available, is substantially the same provision as appears in the Mutual Security Act. As a matter of fact, it is doubtful if 50 percent will be carried in American bottoms, because I understand that they are not available at this time.

Mr. CASE. While the Senator from South Dakota is in support of this particular measure, at the same time I think we ought to be a little careful about turning such measures into subsidies for the merchant marine or anything else, unless they are clearly labeled as such.

Mr. AIKEN. I know just what the Senator from South Dakota means, because we have debated that subject on the floor frequently in the past few years.

Mr. CASE. Should it not be clearly understood that the appropriations authorized in this measure will be to make payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation for the commodities supplied, and not for transportation, and that the transportation costs, if paid for by the Mutual Security Administration, should come from Mutual Security Administration funds?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. Reverting for a moment to the Korean situation, in my discussion with the Korean Ambassador he pointed out that the South Koreans would be happy if the commodities intended for them were simply made available f. o. b. port of departure. If, in addition, we were to lend them some of our idle Liberty ships which are in mothballs at the present time, they would provide the

sailors and provide the operating expenses. If we would place the food on our docks and lend them some ships, they would man the ships and take care of the transportation.

Mr. AIKEN. I have not the slightest doubt that generous treatment will be accorded South Korea in this respect, as it should be. If we contribute the commodities at shipside to the foreign government, then it is up to the foreign government to furnish the transportation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield. I wish to yield soon to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Certain organizations such as CARE and CROP, two excellent organizations, have in the past taken care of some of the shipping costs themselves when surplus foods have been made available. Such a provision is not included in this bill. I mention it only as a reminder in connection with future legislation. In the past we have utilized at least the administrative organizations of such relief groups. I believe that in the case of Yugoslavia the Government of the United States paid the shipping charges.

I make this comment because I intend to press as hard as I can for overall, long-term legislation to empower the President of the United States, as the chief spokesman for this Nation in foreign affairs, to utilize some of our surplus goods for these purposes. I do not believe it ought always to be on a gift basis. The proposal which I have in mind, and which I discussed before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, would have permitted the President to make a gift, as provided in this bill, with the provision that local currencies be used for rehabilitation or improvement within the particular country; secondly, it would have permitted the President to sell on the basis of a loan, which was the method used in the case of the India wheat, at least in part; or, thirdly—and I think this is important—it would have permitted sale at a concessional price. The present law permits sale out of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, but at the amount which the Commodity Credit Corporation has invested in such stocks. If we were to give the President the authority to sell at a concessional price, we would have an opportunity at times to do business with countries which cannot pay the prevailing world price for a particular commodity. I make this observation only because this is the appropriate time to comment.

In the case of military assistance for our allies, we have an overall program. We do not introduce and have reported a special bill every time we wish to give military assistance to a friendly nation. We ought to be equipped to provide food assistance when it is necessary. Certainly food is just as important to the survival and stability of a country as military equipment, if not much more so, particularly when there is no hot war going on.

I cannot help but believe that we are a little better equipped to produce food

economically than to produce guns economically. We can produce food at less cost to the Government, and with less difficulty for the population, than in the case of military supplies. We have never had to regiment our economy to produce food. We have almost had to regiment our economy in order to stop producing food.

I know that the President will ask for overall legislation. I shall support it. I wish such legislation could be enacted this year, because I think the psychological situation requires that the United States show the world that, although we are prepared to spend several billion dollars for military assistance, if need be, we would rather provide food assistance. This bill provides it in one specific instance; but mark my words, as the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] pointed out, if peace comes to Korea it will bring in its wake problems as great as those of war. Special legislation will be introduced to provide aid to Korea. I hope that such aid can be provided under general legislation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, let me point out that this relief to Pakistan was not delayed for inclusion in a general bill because the President felt that the need in this case was urgent. The State Department and other agencies believe it essential that some wheat begin to arrive in Pakistan by the first of August. That is the reason why this part of the overall program was singled out for quick action.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Are there any similar programs contemplated for other nations? Pakistan is the only one mentioned in the bill, but are there in prospect this year any similar plans for other nations?

Mr. AIKEN. No. Pakistan is almost the only populous nation, outside the war-torn areas, that did not have pretty good crops last year. In the contributions to Pakistan, however, there is participation on the part of Canada and Australia.

Mr. STENNIS. That was the next question I had in mind. What other nations are contributing, and what is their contribution?

Mr. AIKEN. I believe Canada is contributing \$10 million worth of wheat, which would provide about 105,000 tons. Australia is contributing 45,000 tons, through a grant of \$4½ million. We have the most to give. However, I am inclined to think that the 45,000 tons contributed by Australia represents as large a proportion of the total supply as what we are giving.

Mr. STENNIS. So far as the Senator knows, have there been any requests from other nations similarly situated?

Mr. AIKEN. There are no urgent requests that I know of.

I think we must be careful, in these mutual assistance programs which involve the use of surplus American farm commodities, to see that we do not hurt the economy of small producing nations. In the case of Pakistan there is a near disaster. It might become a complete

disaster before next winter if we did not help.

In the case of certain other nations which probably would like some of our surplus commodities at lower prices, I think we should make sure that any low-cost commodities from the United States are in addition to the supply normally used, and are not used to supplant the normal purchases made from other small producing nations of the world, which might go broke if we gave away too much.

Mr. STENNIS. I should like to ask one more brief question. I invite the attention of the Senator to paragraph (b), on page 3, which, including the committee amendment, reads as follows:

(b) To give full and continuous publicity in Pakistan to the assistance furnished by the United States; and to provide such supplies free of cost to persons who, by virtue of circumstances beyond their control, are unable to pay for them.

With reference to the Senator's discussion as to what these funds are to be used for, in view of the distressing conditions upon which the bill is based, does not the committee amendment make it almost certain that all of this wheat will be given to those who, by virtue of circumstances beyond their control, are unable to provide such supplies—that is, unable to pay for them?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; the committee amendment would provide for giving the wheat to those who are unable to pay for it, but not to those who are able to pay.

Mr. STENNIS. Will not the portion going to those unable to pay represent virtually all of it?

Mr. AIKEN. The committee amendment, which has been approved by the Senate, was placed in the paragraph above. It was misplaced in the printing. It refers to supplies made available under the act among the people of Pakistan, without discrimination, and provides that such supplies are to go free of cost to persons who, by virtue of circumstances beyond their control, are unable to pay for the wheat.

Mr. STENNIS. My question would still apply, then.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Florida proposed the amendment in the committee, I think. The Senator is on his feet and it might be well for him to tell us exactly what the amendment means.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Florida may be permitted to answer the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Vermont has perhaps overlooked the fact that the Senator who suggested this amendment was the present occupant of the chair, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. His position was supported by the Senator from Florida. However, it should be stated that the Senator from Minnesota was the one who first urged this point.

To state the matter as clearly as I can, from my recollection, 2 years of drought

have brought about a very bad situation in west Pakistan. Even after the furnishing of supplies of wheat by Australia and Canada, other supplies from other nations under the Colombo Pact, and other supplies by way of barter, in which Pakistan is using some of her products in order to get food, there is still lacking about one-fourth of the normal full annual supply of wheat in west Pakistan.

That means that for about 25 million people, as I believe we were told, famine is imminent, and starvation is threatening.

It was our thought, in considering the making of this gift, that the United States should contribute not just to those people who might be able to buy the wheat—and there are many in Pakistan who are able to buy it with rupees, which in turn will be used to help to permanently solve the food-production problem—but should also contribute wheat to those who are not able to buy it.

Therefore, the words under discussion were inserted in the bill, with the thought that the act itself would make clear the fact, although we do not pretend to go in and distribute the supplies which we are furnishing, that at the same time we expect our friendly neighbor, Pakistan, which will handle the distributing of the wheat to its own people, to recognize the want of those who do not have the means with which to pay for the wheat, in the same way as those who can pay are recognized.

It is the understanding of the Senator from Florida that the amount which will be given free will be only a part of the whole, and less than half of the whole, because the whole supply will take care of about 3 months of the entire wheat needs of West Pakistan, both on the part of those who can pay and those who cannot pay, most of whom, if this wheat were not being used, would go hungry.

So the wheat will be used to supply those who are not able to pay, which includes both farming people and those whose business has been pretty well wiped out by the difficulties of the farming people, and will also supply the need for bread and the need for wheat of those who are able to pay. Does that answer the question of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Florida very much. So far as it goes, it does answer the question. Will the chairman of the committee state what the estimate is of the percentage of the entire wheat to be delivered and distributed under this clause in the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont does not know what percentage of the wheat will be given free to people without rupees in Pakistan, but he would point out the safeguard contained in the bill, which provides that no wheat at all shall be delivered until an agreement containing certain provisions has been entered into between Pakistan and the United States. I think that is a good safeguard in general.

Mr. STENNIS. I would not say that the bill is unsound. It seems to me, however, that some reasonable limitation

should be placed in it, based on a good judgment of the facts. Perhaps the agreement would take care of that point.

Mr. AIKEN. I will say to the Senator from Mississippi that the bill contains sufficient safeguards to prevent unjustified use of this wheat by the Government of Pakistan, such as free distribution to persons who are able to pay for it. The House committee is considering the bill today, and if it is felt that the details should be spelled out, they can be considered.

Mr. STENNIS. The chairman of the committee represents to the Senate that it would be his purpose to follow up that thought, so as to make sure that such a safeguard is provided, so far as it is possible to do so?

Mr. AIKEN. I believe it is the purpose of the committee to make certain that the privilege of giving away our wheat shall not be abused. It would not be advantageous to Pakistan to abuse it, because the money received for the wheat would be spent for making permanent improvements in that country.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for one more observation?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to say, first, that the bill had the unanimous support of all members of the committee on both sides of the aisle, and was completely and is completely bipartisan and nonpartisan.

Second, I want to make the same statement with reference to all three of the committee amendments which are in the bill.

Third, I want to make the same statement with reference to the fact that all of the committee members recognized the fact that the President, in making the agreement with Pakistan, will of course deal with the details, which are inappropriate to be set out in a bill, as they shall have been brought up to date and as they shall have developed up to that time, so as to meet the changing situation, whatever it may be.

Mr. President, I close by saying that the statements made to the committee by those who had gone to Pakistan to review the situation on the ground—men who were chosen from various schools, and I remember in particular the dean of the college of agriculture at Purdue University and one of his professors—made it clear that they believe this grant will take care of the critical situation, in view of the fact that the present year promises vastly improved crop conditions in Pakistan.

If I may be permitted to make one further observation, Mr. President, I should like to say that the committee wants it clearly understood that the grant has no relation to the price-support program or to any domestic agricultural program. It is just incidental that our Nation does own wheat in abundance. However, no member of the committee would want it understood that in any way through this grant, or similar grants that might be necessitated by famine or starvation of human beings anywhere, we propose to create the impression that we are seeking to

justify or affect any price-support program.

I am sure that the Senator from Vermont, the distinguished chairman of the committee, will make it clear that this subject was handled by the committee as having no relation to that program, but simply as showing the willingness of our Nation to meet a tragic need on the part of suffering human beings who have done their utmost to meet their own critical problem, and whom we know to be, besides, a very fine people, who believe in freedom and who are showing their devotion to freedom in many tangible ways.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Florida has stated the situation very clearly. I yield now to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, no printed report of the hearings of the committee is available, as I understand. I did not hear the first part of the Senator's statement, and I, therefore, inquire as to whether the chairman of the committee or any other Senator has stated for the RECORD, for the information of the American people, anything with regard to the relations which have existed and exist between Pakistan and the United States and between Pakistan and the United Nations. Did the Senator from Vermont deal with that in the opening part of his statement?

Mr. AIKEN. No; not directly.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it seems that in this country we are developing some kind of a complex whereby sometimes we are afraid to proclaim some of the reasons which prompt our attitude and our delight at being able to extend a helping hand to a friend who is in distress.

I may be in error, but I seem to recall that at about the time of the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, Pakistan was one of the first nations to offer to send a substantial number of troops to fight under the banner of the United Nations in Korea, in resisting Communist aggression there. I may be confusing Pakistan with some other country, in that connection; but I believe I am correct about that matter.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Georgia may be correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe Pakistan offered to send a full brigade of troops to fight with the soldiers of the United States and the soldiers of other nations which were undertaking to draw a line against armed aggression, and to say, "This far, and no farther, shall armed aggression take away the freedom of those who desire to enjoy the privileges of freedom."

So, Mr. President, I take particular delight in voting for this bill. I may be a little old fashioned, but I am never afraid to rise and to say to the entire world that the United States does not forget its friends when they are in trouble or in need.

I am perfectly willing to say, further, that in my own scrutiny of the foreign-aid programs, I propose to be much more generous with nations whose friendship to us is unquestioned than I do with those whose attitude is friendly toward coun-

tries which threaten the freedom of men everywhere.

Pakistan, by virtue of its situation, has had great difficulties in getting under way as a free nation. I believe the American people, should ever recall the fact that Pakistan was one of the first nations to rise to the support of the United Nations, and that the only thing that prevented the Pakistanis from actually landing their troops on the peninsula of Korea was the difficulty they had with India over the Province of Kashmir.

I believe this statement should be made a part of this record, and I believe we should state clearly that we desire to aid a country which has shown its friendship to the endeavor to prevent armed aggression and the effort to bring about peace in the world.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia has made a most valuable contribution to the discussion.

I wish to add that the Pakistanis have made it perfectly clear that they have not the slightest intention of turning one inch toward communism, regardless of whether this wheat is given to them. The Pakistanis want that clearly understood. They are desperately in need of the wheat, but they are not threatening to swing in the other direction if they do not get it. They are prepared to stand by.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am glad to yield the floor to the Senator from Wisconsin. I am sure what he will say will also be music to my ears.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to all the statements which have been made in connection with this bill. I agree that it is in accordance with our Christian principles to do what the bill contemplates. It certainly is in the interest of our foreign policy and in the interest of maintaining and of retaining, as has been suggested by the Senator from Vermont, the friendship of the people of Pakistan. So I am very much in favor of the bill.

In the Foreign Relations Committee we had occasion to consider this matter in connection with the mutual aid bill. We were given the facts. We recognize that this bill takes care of a situation which, from every point of view, should be taken care of, considering the tremendous supply of wheat we have in storage and the large supply which now is coming into being.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there are no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2112) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to make available to the President out of wheat stocks acquired through price-support operations not to exceed 1 million long tons of wheat, during the period ending June 30, 1954, for transfer to the Government of Pakistan upon such terms and conditions as the President determines ap-

propriate, of which 700,000 tons may be made available in order to alleviate starvation and mass suffering threatened by famine conditions in Pakistan and not to exceed 300,000 tons to provide such reserve supply as he may determine to be a necessary supplement to such emergency assistance. Commodity Credit Corporation shall deliver the wheat on board vessels in United States ports as directed by the President. At least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of wheat made available under this act and transported from the United States on ocean vessels shall be so transported on United States flag vessels to the extent practicable and to the extent such vessels are available at market rates for United States flag vessels.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of making payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities disposed of hereunder, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are equal to the Corporation's investment in such commodities, including handling costs, plus the costs incurred in making deliveries hereunder. Any funds or other assets available to the Commodity Credit Corporation may be used, in advance of such appropriation or payments, for carrying out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 3. No assistance under authority of this act shall be made available until an agreement is entered into between Pakistan and the United States containing the following undertakings, and any others the President may determine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of this act, on the part of Pakistan:

(a) To distribute the supplies made available under this act, among the people of Pakistan without discrimination, and to provide such supplies free of cost to persons who, by virtue of circumstances beyond their control, are unable to pay for them.

(b) To give full and continuous publicity in Pakistan to the assistance furnished by the United States.

(c) To permit persons designated by the Government of the United States to observe without restriction the distribution in Pakistan of supplies made available under authority of this act.

(d) To deposit in a special account amounts of the currency of Pakistan equivalent to the amounts of such currency accruing to the Government of Pakistan from the import and sale of commodities furnished as a grant hereunder, this account to be utilized as may be agreed upon by the United States and the Government of Pakistan for the benefit of the people of Pakistan in programs to increase food production and in other projects and programs in the mutual interest of the United States and Pakistan.

(e) To allocate to the use of the Government of the United States 5 percent of the local currency account established in subsection (d) for use, in accordance with applicable United States laws, for local currency requirements of the United States, including administrative and operating expenses in Pakistan in connection with assistance supplied by the United States.

(f) To pursue all appropriate measures to reduce its relief needs and to increase production and supply and improve distribution of foodstuffs within Pakistan so as to lessen the danger of similar emergencies in the future.

SEC. 4. All or any part of the assistance provided hereunder shall be terminated by the President whenever he or Congress by concurrent resolution, determines that because of changed conditions continuation of assistance is unnecessary or undesirable. Termination of assistance to Pakistan under this section may include the termination of deliveries of all supplies scheduled under this act and not yet delivered.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this act shall affect the applicability of section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, or other provisions of law to the local currency allocated to the use of the United States in accordance with the agreement provided for in section 3.

YOUNG REPUBLICANS SUPPORT ALLIED UNITY AND AMERICAN LEADERSHIP

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Saturday certain folks at the Wisconsin State Republican convention engineered actions designed to turn the clock back in America's history. They endeavored to have our country turn its back on its leadership in world affairs, by supporting a constitutional amendment whose effect would be to wreck our foreign policy.

In the same newspapers which recorded this unfortunate action there was carried a dispatch from South Dakota reporting the results of the convention of the Young Republican National Federation, which took a completely opposite approach—a sound, intelligent, enlightened approach. Unanimously, the 1,000 delegates approved American foreign policy, based on collective security. Not one delegate supported the idea of having America abandon the United Nations. Tribute was paid to the great majority leader of the United States Senate—the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Action was taken on other resolutions—some controversial, some not.

An effort was made in the convention to secure endorsement of the Bricker amendment, but no such action was taken.

I do not have available a transcript of the convention's proceedings, but I know that the action taken on behalf of a constructive foreign policy represents the will of the American people in seeking a foreign policy of leadership. The Young Republicans represented the thinking not only of the Young Republican movement, but of the senior Republican movement. In this instance the young people were far closer to the mark than were some of their parents.

I send to the desk the text of this news dispatch, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed following my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of June 14, 1953]

YOUNG GOP SUPPORTS U. N.—O. K.'s COLLECTIVE SECURITY

RAPID CITY, S. DAK.—The Young Republican National Federation, with more than 1,000 delegates from 45 States, Saturday unanimously supported a "collective security" foreign policy based on continuing membership in the United Nations, and said American sacrifices in Korea "have not been in vain."

Without dissent, the Young Republicans espoused the foreign policy of President Eisenhower, rather than that urged by Senator TAFT, of Ohio. In the 1952 campaign TAFT attacked the Korean conflict as "Truman's war," and recently he urged future United States reliance on military alliances rather than the United Nations.

Supporting the administration move for an armistice in Korea, the Young Republicans declared their belief that, "though costly and heartbreaking, Korea has been a symbol of the free world's determination to stop the aggression of the Soviet Union and its satellites, and to that end American sacrifices have not been in vain."

PEACE CALLED INDIVISIBLE

There was no discussion on this point, although many Republican orators in the last campaign challenged the wisdom of former President Truman in sending United States troops to resist Communist aggression in Korea in June 1950.

"Peace is indivisible and must be achieved in the forum of nations," the foreign policy resolution said. "Peace cannot be lastingly achieved in isolation, but only by effective co-operation with the community of nations. Regional alliances are only supplemental to the basic collective purposes of the United Nations, for we know that global peace cannot be attained in a piecemeal fashion."

Not a single delegate arose to espouse the Taft argument that the United States should extricate itself from the United Nations. The delegates, however, did declare unanimously their admiration of Taft for the leadership he had given the party and the support he had given the Eisenhower administration program in Congress. Hope was expressed that Taft's health would improve rapidly so that he could resume active leadership of the Republican majority in the Senate.

SECURITY MOVE BACKED

The convention approved without dissent a resolution commending the administration for the great progress it has made in ferreting subversives out of the Government service, and urging continued vigilance in this direction.

A cheer greeted the resolution that pledged the Young Republicans to stand for adequate safeguards to protect the rights of individuals who appear before either administration loyalty boards or legislative investigating committees. A predicted floor fight over the investigating methods of Senator McCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, did not materialize.

The Republican juniors also went on record in support of the administration's request for extension until December 30 of the excess-profits tax, and urged its replacement at that time, if necessary, by other sources of revenue.

There was no debate on a proposal that the individual States, rather than Federal Government, enact immediately effective fair-employment-practices legislation. A. Price Woodward, of Wichita, Kans., a Negro delegate, was presiding at the time.

Other resolutions that were adopted:

Supported extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act and systematic reduction or elimination of tariffs and trade barriers.

Sidestepped endorsement of the Bricker amendment, which would bar any treaty or international agreement from superseding domestic legislation.

Asked revision of the McCarran-Walter immigration law.

Supported proposals to lower the voting age from 21 to 18.

Asked a congressional study of the advisability of returning federally owned lands and minerals to the States in which they are located.

Opposed expansion of the national service life insurance program for Armed Forces personnel. (The vote on this was 294 to 270.)

Sullivan Barnes, 31, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., was elected president of the federation at the closing session Saturday night. He received 430 votes; Herbert W. Beitel, of Chicago, 112; and Carlton Rouh, of Lindenwood, N. J., 25.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN CHARTERS OF VESSELS TO CITIZENS OF THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 88, Calendar No. 404.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 88) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to extend certain charters of vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota for the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I should like to discuss the joint resolution and also the measure which the distinguished Senator from South Dakota will call up next, namely, Senate Joint Resolution 72. These joint resolutions are companion measures, in that Senate Joint Resolution 88, which is now under consideration, will authorize a continuation of the chartering of eight ships by citizens of the Republic of the Philippines. These ships have been chartered for the past 6 years. They are slow, wartime-built ships, which have little or no value to our own merchant marine, but they are serving a very useful purpose and are engaged in a very useful service in the intercoastal trade in the Philippines. So the joint resolution would simply continue for another year the chartering of the ships.

The other joint resolution, which I should like to discuss briefly at this time, authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to sell the same eight ships to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines, and to sell them at the Ship Sales Act price.

When the Philippine Rehabilitation Act was initiated in 1946, many citizens of the Philippines who had had ships, but who had lost them during the war, were not able to have their claims settled in time to allow them to purchase ships under the Ship Sales Act, which was a measure by which we allowed many citizens of foreign nations and many foreign nations themselves to purchase American wartime-built ships. So the Philippines, because of the fact that their claims were not settled in time, were precluded from purchasing the ships.

The two resolutions have been reported unanimously by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. They have been endorsed by the Department of Commerce and the Department of State, and we have a letter from the Government of the Philippines asking for the passage of the two measures.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 88) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provisions of existing law, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to extend and continue the present charters of vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines, which charters were made and entered into under the terms of section 306 (A) of the act of April 30, 1946 (Public Law 370, 79th Congress), and which charters were extended by the Secretary of Commerce under the terms of a joint resolution, approved April 30, 1952 (Public Law 327, 82d Congress). Such charters may be further extended for such periods of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may, from time to time, determine to be required in the interest of the economy of the Philippines, but any such charter shall contain a provision requiring that the vessel shall be operated only in the interisland commerce in the Philippines. No such vessel shall be continued under charter, as authorized herein, beyond the completion of the first voyage terminating after June 30, 1954.

SALE OF CERTAIN VESSELS TO PHILIPPINE CITIZENS FOR USE IN INTERISLAND SERVICES

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 405, Senate Joint Resolution 72.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the joint resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 72) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines; to provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Philippines, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 72) which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, on page 3, line 12, after the word "Philippines", to insert a colon and "Provided, however, That the Secretary of Commerce, after consultation with the National Advisory Council in International Monetary and Financial Problems, shall fix the terms of payment on unpaid balances, which terms shall in no event be more favorable than the terms applicable in the case of sales to citizens of the United States"; on page 4, line 8, after the word "provided", to

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 18, 1953
For actions of June 17, 1953
83rd-1st, No. 110

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....	2,6	Foreign aid.....	1,15	T.V.A.....	2
Bankruptcy.....	14	Lands, grazing.....	11	Trade agreements.....	8
Cattle industry.....	9	Mutual security.....	1	Trade, foreign.....	8
Contracts.....	7	Personnel.....	10	Treaties.....	16
Economic controls.....	3	Prices, farm.....	9	War powers.....	5
Electrification.....	13	Retirement.....	10	Wheat.....	1,15
Farm program.....	12	Rubber.....	4		

HIGHLIGHTS: House debated 2nd independent offices appropriation bill. House Rules Committee cleared wheat-for-Pakistan and mutual security bills. House agreed to conference report on economic controls bill. Senate committee ordered reported Interior appropriation bill.

HOUSE

1. FOREIGN AID. The Rules Committee reported a resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 5659, to provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan. This bill directs the Commodity Credit Corporation to make available to the President up to 1 million long tons of wheat (approximately 37 million bushels) to be transferred to the Government of Pakistan in order to alleviate starvation and famine conditions in Pakistan and to provide that country with some reserve supply of this important food grain. The wheat will come from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation acquired pursuant to price-support operations. The bill provides that no wheat shall be transferred to Pakistan until the United States and Pakistan have entered into an agreement as to its use and distribution. This agreement is to include the following provisions:

(1) Distribution of the wheat without discrimination among the people of Pakistan and without cost to those who, through no fault of their own are unable to purchase it; (2) full publicity to the assistance furnished by the people of the United States; (3) unrestricted observation of the distribution procedure by United States observers; (4) utilization of any local currency derived by Pakistan from the sale of donated wheat; in a manner agreed upon by the United States and the Government of Pakistan, for programs to increase food production in Pakistan and other projects of mutual interest to the two countries; (5) allocation of 5 percent of the local currency received for the use of the United States within Pakistan; and (6) the taking of all appropriate measures to reduce and prevent further relief needs. The bill also authorizes an appropriation for the purpose of making payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation for the wheat made available to Pakistan. The Corporation, however, is authorized to make the wheat available in advance of receiving payment therefor.

The Rules Committee reported a resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 5710, the Mutual Security Agency authorization bill (p. 6963).

2. APPROPRIATIONS. Concluded debate on H.R. 5690, 2nd independent offices appropriation bill for 1954, but deferred final action until today, June 18 (pp. 6909-62).

Rejected the following amendments:

By Rep. Cooper, by 83-154, to increase funds by \$30 million for construction of a steam plant at the Fulton site, Tenn. (pp. 6911-26).

By Rep. Andrews, by 33-114, to delete language preventing the moving of TVA headquarters to Muscle Shoals, Alabama (pp. 6926-30).

By Rep. Jones (Alabama), by 46-101, to increase TVA funds by \$2,377,000 for resource development (pp. 6931-2).

The Appropriations Committee reported H.R. 5805, the legislative-judicial appropriation bill for 1954; and the Rules Committee reported a resolution for its consideration (H. Rept. 598). (p. 6971).

3. ECONOMIC CONTROLS. Agreed to the conference report on S. 1081, providing for temporary economic controls (pp. 6907-8). For provisions of the conference report see Digest 109.
4. RUBBER. The Armed Services Committee reported with amendment H.R. 5728, to authorize disposal of Government owned rubber-producing facilities (H. Rept. 593) (p. 6971).
5. WAR POWERS. Passed without amendment H.R. 2557, to extend title 2 of the First War Powers Act (contract authority of the President) through June 30, 1954 (pp. 6969-70).

SENATE

6. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) with amendments H.R. 4828, Interior appropriation bill for 1954. The "Daily Digest" states: "As approved, the bill would provide for a total of \$451,256,940, an increase of \$45,126,597 over the House-passed figure of \$406,130,343." (p. D569.)
- The Appropriations Subcommittee ordered reported to the full committee with amendments H.R. 5376, Army civil functions appropriation bill for 1954 (p. D569).

7. CONTRACTS. The "Daily Digest" states that the Government Operations Committee ordered reported as a committee amendment, an amendment to S. 690, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services of 1949 relating to lease-purchase agreements. "This amendment would provide for submission of lease-purchase agreements to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House for reference to appropriate committees." (p. D570.)

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

8. FOREIGN TRADE. Extension of remarks by Rep. Sieminski discussing how high a tariff should be (p. A3720).
- Extension of remarks by Rep. Pelly in favor of H.R. 5495, to extend the reciprocal trade agreements authority for 1 year (pp. A3728-29).
9. CATTLE INDUSTRY. Extension of remarks by Rep. Rogers (Tex.) stating that the small rancher and cattle farmer is in danger of "bankruptcy and annihilation" from falling cattle prices and an unprecedented draught, and inserting a petition on this subject (pp. A3720-21).

CONSIDERATION OF H. R. 5659

JUNE 17, 1953.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. Res. 293]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 293, report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.

26008



House Calendar No. 80

83^D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 293

[Report No. 601]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 17, 1953

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

RESOLUTION

1 *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it
2 shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into
3 the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union
4 for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5659) to provide for
5 the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan, and all points
6 of order against said bill or any provisions contained in said
7 bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall
8 be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed one hour,
9 to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and
10 ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture,
11 the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute
12 rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for

1 amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to
2 the House with such amendments as may have been adopted
3 and the previous question shall be considered as ordered
4 on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without
5 intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

House Calendar No. 80

83d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 293

[Report No. 601]

RESOLUTION

Providing for the consideration of H. R. 5659,
a bill to provide for the transfer of price-
support wheat to Pakistan.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois

JUNE 17, 1953

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be
printed

6/22/53

6. NOMINATION of Mrs. Katherine Howard as Deputy Federal Civil Defense Administrator was confirmed (p. 7207).
7. HOUSING. The Banking and Currency Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) S. 2103, to amend the National Housing Act, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute (p. D590).
8. FOREIGN TRADE. Received the fifth annual report of the Tariff Commission on the operation of the trade agreements program, from July 1951 to June 1952 (p. 7160).
9. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Morse spoke on "The Cadillac Crusade Against Public Power," criticizing the Administration's public power policies; and claiming that private utility operators are out to dominate REA and TVA (pp. 7185-205). He also discussed the Secretary's and the REA Administrator's views on public power (p. 7196).
10. IRRIGATION. Received a California Legislature resolution urging direct loans to the districts of the Central Valley for construction of distribution systems in connection with their irrigation program (p. 7163).

HOUSE

11. FOREIGN AID. Began debate on H. R. 5659, to provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan, and began reading the bill for amendment (pp. 7727-28, 7211).

Rep. Rooney stated that he would offer an amendment to H. R. 5659 requiring that at least 50% of the wheat be shipped to Pakistan in U. S. flag vessels (p. 7213). The same language is contained in S. 2112, the Senate companion bill.

12. PERSONNEL; LEAVE. Both Houses received the conference report on H. R. 4654, to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 (H. Rept. 629) (pp. 7165, 7214-7). The following are some of the more important provisions of the bill as reported from conference:

Section 202 of the Annual and Sick Leave Act is amended to provide that this title shall not apply to the following officers in the executive branch, including officers of corporations wholly owned or controlled by the U. S.: Persons appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, or by the President alone, whose rates of basic compensation exceed the maximum rate provided in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949; persons receiving compensation in accordance with section 411 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946; and such other officers (except postmasters, U. S. attorneys, and U. S. marshals) as may be designated by the President.

The accumulated and current accrued annual leave to which any exempted officer is entitled immediately prior to the enactment hereof shall be liquidated by a lump-sum payment. An exempted officer again coming under the Leave Act shall be credited with the unused annual and sick leave standing to his credit at the time he was exempted.

Section 203 (c) is amended to provide that the annual leave provided for in this section, which is not used, shall accumulate for use in succeeding years until it totals 30 days at the beginning of the first complete biweekly pay period.

Section 208 (a) is amended to provide that the accumulated annual leave to the credit of an employee immediately following the end of the last complete biweekly pay period in the calendar year 1952, or the amount in excess

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued
For actions of

June 23, 1953
June 22, 1953
83rd-1st, No. 113

CONTENTS

Animal diseases.....	20	Foreign aid.....	11	Research.....	20
Appropriations.....	13,30,31	Hawaii statehood.....	23	Small business.....	2,15
Budgeting.....	19	Housing.....	7	Tariff.....	28
Butter.....	21	Irrigation.....	10	Taxation.....	29
Cattle industry.....	5	Lands, grazing.....	22	Trade, foreign.....	8,24
Cottonseed.....	4	public.....	3	Transportation.....	16,17
Dairy industry.....	21	Leave.....	12	Treaties.....	25
Economic controls.....	1,15	Loans, farm.....	14	Vehicle storage.....	18
Education.....	26	Nomination.....	6	Veterans' benefits.....	14
Electrification.....	9,27	Personnel.....	2,12	Wheat.....	11
Extension Service.....	32	Prices, support.....	4		
Flood control.....	27	Purchasing.....	24		

HIGHLIGHTS: House debated wheat-for-Pakistan bill. House passed legislative-judiciary appropriation bill. Both Houses received conference report on leave bill. Senate rejected conference report on economic controls bill and asked for new conference. Sen. Maybank criticized USDA's cottonseed price support reduction.

SENATE

1. ECONOMIC CONTROLS. Rejected, by 42-47, the conference report on S. 1081, economic controls bill, and requested a new conference with the House, instructing its conferees to strike out title 2 of the bill, to establish a Small Business Administration, and to substitute instead the Small Defense Plants Administration provision, as originally contained in the Senate bill. Sens. Capehart, Bricker, Bennett, Bush, Maybank, Fulbright and Robertson (same conferees as previously) were appointed as conferees (pp. 7150-60, 7171-74).
2. PERSONNEL. Passed H.R. 4126 to continue employee war-risk hazard and detention benefits until July 1, 1954, with an amendment substituting the language of S. 1458 as reported. The Judiciary Committee had previously been discharged from further consideration of H.R. 4126 (pp. 7176-77).
3. SUBMERGED LANDS. Debated S. 1901, to provide for U.S. jurisdiction over the submerged lands on the outer Continental Shelf (pp. 7175, 7178-84).
4. COTTONSEED; PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Maybank criticized the Secretary's order reducing the support price on cottonseed to 75% of parity and claimed that this was a forerunner of the same treatment to other farm products (p. 7175).
5. CATTLE INDUSTRY. Sen. Johnson stated that the cattle situation in Texas and the Southwest was "fast becoming desperate" because of the drop in cattle prices and the "most devastating drought the area has ever known", and inserted an Armarillo Globe-Times editorial on this subject (pp. 7184-85).

cerns the Department of Defense. Sections 1 (c) and 1 (d) of Reorganization Plan No. 6 would give further powers to the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Many of us feel that this is a step in the direction toward the German or Prussian-type of General Staff and therefore should be opposed.

At the Government Operations Committee this morning, we approved the resolution of Mr. HOFFMAN, the distinguished chairman of our committee, House Resolution 264, which will approve Reorganization Plan No. 6, but delete therefrom subsections 1 (c) and 1 (d). That resolution is now before the Rules Committee. I am hopeful that the Rules Committee will give us a rule so that this important matter might come before the House.

In the event, however, that the Rules Committee sees fit not to give Mr. HOFFMAN a rule, I have introduced a disapproving resolution to Reorganization Plan No. 6, and also specific legislation, H. R. 5845, to accomplish the purpose of bringing the entire plan into operation with the exception of the two paragraphs which we consider objectionable. The Government operations committee today approved H. R. 5845 and it, like House Resolution 264, is now pending before the Rules Committee. In the event that the Rules Committee does not take action either on House Resolution 264 or H. R. 5845, I intend to ask the Committee on Government Operations to consider my disapproving resolution, House Resolution 295. Thereafter, I will bring my resolution, House Resolution 295, to the floor of the House, either on a motion to discharge the committee or after favorable action by the Government Operations Committee if that committee takes such action. It seems to me that this matter is of such importance that the full House should have the opportunity to consider the issue squarely.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. HOLIFIELD) was granted permission to address the House tomorrow for 30 minutes, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was granted permission to address the House today for 30 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was granted permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

PICKETING THE WHITE HOUSE

(Mr. STEED asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, now that the Rosenberg case is out of the way, and now that all of us can consider this matter in calm and considered way, and since

this is also District of Columbia Day, I rise to urge as strongly as I can that this Congress take action to prohibit picketing in the vicinity of the White House.

Last week during the Rosenberg demonstration a riot was narrowly averted. Time after time, foreign agents have brought to Washington the riffraff of the slums to demonstrate with the White House as a stage, holding this national shrine up to disgrace and ridicule before the world. There has not been a single case in the last 20 years that I can remember when anyone else in America has resorted to use of the White House picketing device to serve their purposes.

Why, then, must this Congress remain silent and permit this sort of thing to continue?

I am not opposed to public demonstrations. But I am opposed to using the White House as a stage for these despicable displays.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Hon. BRADY GENTRY, has introduced a bill (H. R. 3979) to prohibit White House picketing. I urge every Member of the House, and especially the members of the District Committee, to give this legislation immediate and favorable consideration.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. WHEELER asked and was given permission to have vacated the special order granted him for today, and to address the House for 1 hour on Monday next, following the legislative business and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Wednesday next, following any other special orders heretofore entered.

(Mr. BENNETT of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. BENNETT of Florida addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

RESIDUAL FUEL OIL IMPORTS

(Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked this privilege of 1 minute to advise my colleagues of the House that on Friday last I introduced a joint resolution along with the senior Senator from West Virginia, declaring that part of the supplemental Venezuelan reciprocal trade agreement of 1952 that has to do with the importation of residual fuel oil null and void insofar as it applies to the rates being charged under this agreement.

I think I can prove to the Congress that former President Truman exceeded his power in fixing the rate at 5½ cents; that the rate should be 10½ cents; and I would like to remind my colleagues on the left of the aisle that that agreement if amended will bring to the Treasury of

the United States \$26,250 daily based upon the average daily importation of residual fuel oil for the month of May. So I can see no reason why this resolution should not be accepted.

On Wednesday of this week I shall in a special order put some of the detail in the RECORD in order that my colleagues may be advised of the necessity of approving this resolution.

WHEAT FOR PAKISTAN

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I am taking advantage of this means to bring to the attention of the House an important situation with regard to the bill H. R. 5659 which would provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan. The companion bill, S. 2112, which passed the Senate last Tuesday contains a proviso that at least 50 percent of the cargoes of this wheat for Pakistan must be carried in American flag ships. The provision reads as follows:

At least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of wheat made available under this act and transported from the United States on ocean vessels shall be so transported on United States flag vessels to the extent practicable and to the extent such vessels are available at market rates for United States flag vessels.

The bill reported out by the House Committee on Agriculture which we shall consider later today does not contain such a provision. An amendment will be offered either by myself or the Chairman or some other Member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries at the time this bill is read for amendment and will provide the same language as the Senate bill, to-wit, that at least 50 percent of the cargoes of this wheat must be carried in American flag vessels.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, at page 6759 of the RECORD of June 15, 1953, I am quoted near the middle of the first column on that page as saying, "Texas Wool and Mohair Association." The language should read: "Texas Sheep and Goat Raisers' Association." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the permanent RECORD will be corrected accordingly.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, on page 7140 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in the last line of my remarks, the sum of \$575 million appears. This should read "\$475 million." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE ACT OF 1951

Mr. REES of Kansas submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4654) to provide for the exemption from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 of certain officers in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 629)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4654) to provide for the exemption from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 of certain officers in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That section 202 of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 is amended by adding a subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) (1) This title shall not apply to the following officers in the executive branch of the Government and officers of the government of the District of Columbia, including officers of corporations wholly owned or controlled by the United States:

"(A) persons appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, or by the President alone, whose rates of basic compensation exceed the maximum rate provided in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended;

"(B) persons who receive compensation in accordance with section 411 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946; and

"(C) such other officers (except postmasters, United States attorneys, and United States marshals) as may be designated by the President."

No officer in the executive branch of the Government and no officer of the government of the District of Columbia, including an officer of a corporation wholly owned or controlled by the United States, to whom this title applies shall be deemed to be entitled to the compensation attached to his office solely by virtue of his status as an officer.

"(2) The President, in his discretion, may authorize leaves of absence to persons who are exempted from this title pursuant to subsection (c) (1) (B) for use in the United States and its Territories and possessions. Leaves of absence authorized under this subsection shall not constitute a leave system, and no such leave of absence which is not used shall be made the basis for any lump-sum payment."

"Sec. 2. (a) The accumulated and current accrued annual leave to which any officer exempted from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 as a result of the enactment of this Act is entitled immediately prior to the date this Act becomes applicable to him shall be liquidated by a lump-sum payment in accordance with the Act of December 21, 1944 (5 U. S. C. 61b-61e) or the Act of August 3, 1950 (5 U. S. C. 61f-61k), except that payment under either such Act (1) shall be based upon the rate of compensation which he was receiving immediately prior to the date on which this Act became applicable to him, and (2) shall be made without regard to the limitations imposed by the amendments made by sections 4 and 5 of this Act with respect to the amounts of leave compensable under such Acts.

"(b) In the event any such exempted officer, without any break in the continuity of his service, again becomes subject to the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 upon the

completion of his service as an exempted officer, the unused annual and sick leave standing to his credit at the time he was exempted from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 shall be deemed to have remained to his credit.

"SEC. 3. (a) Section 203 (c) of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The annual leave provided for in this section, which is not used by an officer or employee, shall accumulate for use in succeeding years until it totals not to exceed thirty days at the beginning of the first complete biweekly pay period, or corresponding period in the case of an officer or employee who is not paid on the basis of biweekly pay periods, occurring in any year."

"(b) So much of section 203 (d) of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 as precedes paragraph (1) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (c), a maximum accumulation not to exceed forty-five days at the beginning of the first complete biweekly pay period, or corresponding period in the case of an officer or employee who is not paid on the basis of biweekly pay periods, in any year is authorized to the following categories of employees of the Federal Government, other than officers and employees in the Foreign Service of the United States under the Department of State, stationed outside the several States and the District of Columbia:."

"(c) Section 208 (a) of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 208. (a) In any case in which—

"(1) the amount of accumulated annual leave to the credit of an officer or employee immediately following the end of the last complete biweekly pay period in the calendar year 1952, or corresponding period in the case of an officer or employee who is not paid on the basis of biweekly pay periods, under the provisions of law then applicable to such officer or employee is in excess of the amount allowable under the applicable provisions of section 203, or

"(2) the amount of accumulated annual leave to the credit of an officer or employee who is subject to the provisions of section 203 (d) and who becomes subject to the provisions of section 203 (c) is in excess of the amount allowable under section 203 (c), such excess shall remain to the credit of such officer or employee until used, but the use during any leave year of an amount in excess of the aggregate amount which shall have accrued during such year shall automatically reduce the maximum allowable accumulation at the beginning of the first complete biweekly pay period, or corresponding period in the case of an officer or employee who is not paid on the basis of biweekly pay periods, in the following leave year, until the accumulation of such officer or employee no longer exceeds the amount prescribed in the applicable provisions of section 203."

"Sec. 4. (a) The second and third sentences of the first section of the Act of December 21, 1944, are amended to read as follows: 'Such lump-sum payment shall equal the compensation that such officer or employee would have received had he remained in the service until the expiration of the period of such annual or vacation leave, except that after August 31, 1953, no such lump-sum payment shall exceed compensation for any period of such leave in excess of thirty days or the number of days carried over to his credit at the beginning of the leave year in which entitlement to payment occurs, whichever is the greater. If such officer or employee is reemployed (other than in a position exempted from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 under section 202 (b) (1) (B), (C), or (H) of such Act) in the Federal service

or in or under the government of the District of Columbia prior to the expiration of the period covered by such leave payment, he shall refund to the employing agency an amount equal to the compensation covering the period between the date of reemployment and the expiration of such leave period. The leave represented by any such refund—

"(1) in the case of an officer or employee reemployed under the same leave system, shall be recredited to him in the employing agency in an amount equal to the amount represented by the refund;

"(2) in the case of an officer or employee reemployed under a different leave system, shall be recredited to him in the employing agency on an adjusted basis in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Civil Service Commission; and

"(3) in the case of an officer or employee reemployed in an office or position exempted from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 under section 202 (c) (1) of such Act, shall be deemed, upon separation from service, death, or transfer to another office or position in the Government service, to have remained to the credit of such officer or employee.

Any amounts so refunded shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the employing agency. The lump-sum payment herein authorized shall not be regarded, except for purposes of taxation, as salary or compensation and shall not be subject to retirement deductions."

"(b) Section 205 of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection to read as follows:

"(e) In the case of transfer of an officer or employee between positions under different leave systems (other than transfers involving positions exempted under section 202 (b) (1) (B), (C), or (H)), without a break in service, the annual and sick leave to the credit of such officer or employee shall be transferred to his credit in the employing agency on an adjusted basis in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Civil Service Commission."

"Sec. 5. Clause (6) of section 2 of the Act of August 3, 1950, is amended to read as follows: '(6) payment for all accumulated and current accrued annual or vacation leave equal to the compensation the decedent would have received had he remained in service until the expiration of the period of such annual or vacation leave, except that after August 31, 1953, no such lump-sum payment shall exceed compensation for any period of such leave in excess of thirty days or the number of days carried over to his credit at the beginning of the leave year in which entitlement to payment occurs, whichever is the greater;'

"Sec. 6. The heads of the departments and agencies are authorized and directed to take such action as may be necessary to bring about reductions in the accumulated annual leave to the credit of officers and employees which is in excess of the amounts allowable under the applicable provisions of section 203 of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, as amended by this Act, within a reasonable period of years, consistent with the exigencies of the public business, and to make such reports with respect to the action taken as may be requested by the Civil Service Commission. The Civil Service Commission shall include in its annual report to the Congress a statement of the progress made in carrying out the purposes of this section.

"Sec. 7. (a) Section 401 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953 (Public Law 455, Eighty-second Congress), is repealed, effective as of June 29, 1953.

"(b) Sections 3 and 4 of the Act of December 21, 1944, are hereby repealed.

an appropriate means to regulate and control such a system when it is in existence. There shall be included in the report a brief description of the other principal plans considered by the Commission and a summary of the Commission's reasons for discarding such plans as not the best suited."

On page 5, at the end of line 5 add the following new sentence:

"Said report shall be completed within 1 year after the Commission has been implemented with the appropriations herein authorized: *Provided*, That the President, by Executive order, may extend this period for 60 days."

On page 5, line 23, strike out the words "Vice Chairman" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Acting Chairman."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRIEDEL: On page 2, strike out section 2 (a) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. (a) The membership of the Commission shall be as follows:

"1. Four appointed by the President of the United States from the executive branch of the Government or from private life; 2 of the majority party and 2 of the minority party.

"2. One appointed by the President of the United States upon the recommendation of the Governor of the State of Virginia;

"3. One appointed by the President of the United States upon the recommendation of the Governor of the State of Maryland;

"4. Two appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate; 1 of the majority party and 1 of the minority party.

"5. Two appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; 1 of the majority party and 1 of the minority party.

"6. One appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia."

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we have no objection to this amendment. The amendment has been discussed here, and the distinguished member of the committee is to be complimented for making the suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am in entire sympathy with the objectives of the amendment. I prepared an amendment to the proposed section 2 which would have affected the last portion of the provisions with reference to the appointments to be made by the President. I am not entirely certain as to where it would go now in the bill if the amendment is adopted. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he does not feel the provision as to the appointments by the President being limited to those on the recommendation of the Governor of Virginia and the Governor of the State of Maryland is not a rather unusual provision, and one which limits the authority of the President to a degree which possibly was not intended. It would seem to me if the language could direct that the appointments by the President be made after consideration of the recommendations of the two Governors,

that would be more nearly in accord with one of the purposes of this section of the bill, which is to set up representation from the executive department. I am not prepared to submit an amendment at this time, but would like to have this in the RECORD. I wonder if the chairman would not agree with me that it is a proper subject of consideration in conference.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's point is well taken. I feel the committee was working on the overall proposition that the President, along with the Governors, would like to come to an amicable solution of the problems and also come to a working agreement which would in no way cause any friction whatsoever between the District of Columbia and the States involved. However, I feel the gentleman's suggestion as to the wording, after consultation with my colleagues here, is a very good one, and there would be no objection on the part of the subcommittee.

Mr. HESELTON. There is another question I would like to ask the gentleman. I do not know how the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia would be affected by this. In limiting the President's appointments to 2, the provisions beginning with line 20 confine the appointments to 4 appointees having experience in 4 defined fields. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia provides for 1 appointment by the President, after recommendation by the Governor of the State of Virginia, and another after recommendation of the Governor of the State of Maryland; but, obviously, you cannot have 4 appointees out of those 2, and I should imagine some attention should be paid in the conference to correct that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that the expenses of these Commissioners, if they are not State employees or State officials of some kind—do I understand that the Federal Government is going to pay the expenses of this Commission instead of the District of Columbia and the States immediately affected?

Mr. HESELTON. I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. Or the adjacent States?

Mr. HESELTON. I suggest that the gentleman address his question to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. KEARNS. There is an amendment, which will be offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL], and if the gentleman will withhold his question until then, the committee will appreciate it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Section 3, page 3, line 22, strike out "Commission shall elect" and insert "President shall designate."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 2, strike out "Seven" and insert "Five."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 21, insert "*Provided*, That the Commission may employ by contract or otherwise the services of experts and consultants for not in excess of 1 year without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, the civil service and classification laws, or section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROYHILL: On page 4, line 12, after the word "receive", strike "\$50" and insert "\$25."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 8. Committee amendment: Page 5, line 9, strike out "ten" and insert "sixty."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 5, line 11, following "(b):" insert the following: "*Provided*, That, if the President finds there is a reasonable need to extend the existence of the Commission, he may, by Executive order, continue it in full operation for an additional 60 days."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment:

Sec. 9. (a): On page 5, line 20, after "Fairfax", insert "and the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 6, line 9, after "Fairfax", insert "and the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 6, line 12, insert the following paragraph:

"(1) In making its study the Commission shall request the cooperation of the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council in analyzing the problems of community development throughout the Washington metropolitan area that now have, or may in the future have, a bearing upon transportation; the Commission's proposals for a transportation system shall be coordinated with the major thoroughfare and mass transportation plans provided for in the act of July 19, 1952 (86 Stat. 781), and with such elements of the general plan for the region, also provided for in that act. The Commission shall take into consideration, but not be limited to alternative plans for the coordination or unification of all facilities into an integrated system; technical aspects of design and construction of all types of mass transportation facilities; methods of financing; means of equalizing, standardizing, and regulating rates; the integration and continuity of trips; and the most feasible means for continuously regulating and controlling the proposed system when it is made effective. The Commission shall investigate practices elsewhere.

"(2) The Commission shall submit recommendations in the form of a report containing a complete plan for a coordinated or unified system of mass transportation which will be adequate to serve best the

entire Washington metropolitan area at present and in the future, and a plan for the creation of an appropriate means to regulate and control such a system when it is in existence. There shall be included in the report a brief description of the other principal plans considered by the Commission and a summary of the Commission's reasons for discarding such plans as not the best suited."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 7, line 23, after the word "Congress," insert "Said report shall be completed within 1 year after the Commission has been implemented with the appropriations herein authorized: *Provided*, That the President, by Executive order, may extend this period for 60 days."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Section 10 (a), page 8, line 21, strike out "Vice Chairman" and insert "Acting Chairman."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK: On page 8, line 9, strike out all after the period following the word "advisable." down to the period in line 11.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, the committee has no objection to the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK was agreed to.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HALLECK, having resumed the chair, Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2236) for the establishment of a Commission on Area Problems of Greater Washington Metropolitan Area, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WHEAT FOR PAKISTAN

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 293, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5659) to provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan, and all points of order against said bill or any provision contained in said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 61]

Abbitt	Green	Oakman
Adair	Gwynn	O'Hara, Minn.
Addonizio	Hale	O'Konski
Battle	Harrison, Nebr.	O'Neil
Becker	Hart	Osmers
Blatnik	Heller	Ostertag
Bolling	Herlong	Patterson
Bow	Hess	Philbin
Busbey	Hinshaw	Phillips
Bush	Hoffman, Ill.	Powell
Carrigg	Jackson	Price
Case	Javits	Ray
Celler	Jonas, Ill.	Regan
Chatham	Kean	Riehlman
Chelf	Kearney	Rivers
Chiperfield	Keating	Rodino
Chudoff	Kelly, N. Y.	Roosevelt
Cotton	Kersten, Wis.	St. George
Cretella	Kilday	Schenck
Curtis, Mo.	King, Pa.	Secrest
Dawson, Ill.	Klein	Seely-Brown
Dempsey	Lesinski	Small
Dies	Lucas	Stringfellow
Dingell	Lyle	Sutton
Dodd	Mack, Ill.	Taylor
Dollinger	Meador	Teague
Dolliver	Miller, Calif.	Thompson, La.
Donovan	Miller, N. Y.	Thompson, Tex.
Durham	Mollohan	Tuck
Fine	Morano	Wainwright
Fino	Morgan	Wickersham
Fogarty	Morrison	Widnall
Forrester	Moulder	Wigglesworth
Frelinghuysen	Mumma	Yates
Gamble	Nelson	Zablocki
Granahan	Norrell	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 323 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

WHEAT FOR PAKISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is recognized.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

I now yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 293, making in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5659) to provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan.

House Resolution 293 provides for an open rule, waiving points of order against the bill and allows for 1 hour of general debate on the bill itself.

H. R. 5659 was reported unanimously from the Committee on Agriculture and is the result of a request from the President for this legislation on June 10, 1953. The Secretary of State and the Director of Mutual Security both urge the granting of wheat to Pakistan as well as Doctor Harry Reed of Purdue University who headed a mission to Pakistan in order to investigate the food situation there.

The bill proposes to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make available for Pakistan not more than 1 million tons of wheat during the period ending June 30, 1954. This bill specifies that full publicity should be given in Pakistan to the fact that it is coming from the United States and we are also given the right of observing the distribution procedure. The bill also makes mandatory the giving of wheat without discrimination to those people who cannot afford to buy it and specifies that moneys derived from the sale of wheat will be spent on projects agreed to by both the United States and Pakistan aimed at increasing food production.

I hope that the House will adopt House Resolution 293 making in order the consideration of H. R. 5659.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill gives 1 million tons of your taxpayers' wheat to Pakistan. The program will cost \$100 million.

I think this House of Representatives, whether you are for or against the bill, ought to have enough respect for \$100 million of the taxpayers' money to give this bill a little consideration. I think the bill is too vague and indefinite as to what is going to happen to justify us in appropriating this sum without considerable amendment.

I try to be as charitable with the taxpayers' money as anybody else. I like to be charitable with the taxpayers' money but I just do not know exactly how far we ought to go with that charity. We have gone a long ways. We gave these folks our coat last week, and I do not know whether we ought to peel off our shirt or not. I want to think about this thing a good deal.

Many of the Members who were here last year will recall that we gave some wheat to India. I think that bill came out of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I do not know why we should not take it all out of the same pocket or why we should scatter it with one hand to India and with the other to Pakistan; but the fact is that this bill, strange though it may seem, this bill comes out of the Committee on Agriculture. When we gave wheat to India last year there were a lot of us who did not think too much of it.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman says the bill that came out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs last year gave the wheat to India; it was a loan.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman is right. I do not know what the difference is when we are dealing with these bills spreading this stuff around. There may be some theoretical difference and it does sound a little better—I like the word “loan” a lot better than the word “gift,” but do not think you are going to get any money back in either case.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Did they pay it back?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have not been advised that they have. But let me get back to the subject. I want to draw a contrast on the question of our foreign policy, because I am considerably dismayed and confused about it. Now, last year we gave about the same quantity of wheat to India. Well, I have heard tell that we have got to give wheat to Pakistan because Pakistan did not like our giving wheat to India because they did not like India.

Last year when we gave wheat to India there was a lot of opposition and a lot of discussion on the religious aspect. Over there it seems they have sacred monkeys and sacred cows in India, and it is just against their religion to keep the sacred cows and the sacred monkeys out of the feed bin; and, therefore, you have to feed the sacred monkeys and the sacred cows before you can feed the people. So some of us did not like that and we protested.

Some of you may recall that about that time Russia sold India some wheat and got the money for it, and there was a great furor in all the international papers about what a fine thing Russia had done in selling some wheat to India. Then we got around and gave them five times as much and they said nothing about it in any of the papers. I want to know and you ought to want to know that if we are going to give this stuff to these foreign nations for propaganda purposes—that is what they are doing it for—for as long as any of us have lived India has been on a starvation basis. Do you not think we ought to know and know with definite assurance that when we make this gift to these people that we are making it not to the

rulers of Pakistan but that we are making it to the poor people of Pakistan, the ones who are starving to death? And they ought to know where this charity comes from, but they do not know, and that is the best information I can get. Nor do we know what they use the money for that they got from the wheat they sold to the people of India. That money went into that treasury and it probably was used for political purposes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I presume that we have this wheat in surplus; otherwise we would not be proposing to give it away. But I would like to get the reaction of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia on the proposition: Having wheat to give away should we not divert some of it to some of the devastated coal areas of the country where thousands upon thousands of the people are on relief and are hungry?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I get the gentleman's point, and I have sympathy with him and his coal miners, but if he had done what I suggested to him some time ago and rejoined the State of Virginia, we would be able to help him at this time.

Mr. BAILEY. We did not find anybody who wanted to help us pay back the West Virginia debt.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Let us get back to this wheat. In the wheat-to-India proposition we loaned the wheat or sold it to them, but we never got any money, and I do not think we got any thanks. But when we did that for India, we put it down on the seaboard and India paid the freight.

I am trying to get straight what is the present foreign policy? Under this bill we are not only giving it to Pakistan and putting it on board ships, but under the new policy we are going to take it over there and pay the freight and put it on their doorstep. Is that a change in our foreign policy? Are we going to do that for all of these folks?

Last week we gave Pakistan and India \$91 million and this week we are proposing to give Pakistan \$100 million. It strikes me that this is a little bit stiff for one little country when we are trying to spread this charity all over the face of the globe and in all areas of the world. Let us get down to a definite something. Before we pass this bill my suggestion to you is that we know whether we are giving one country more than we ought to give it and whether, when we give it to them, we ought to take it and deposit it on their doorstep. That is contrary to the policy pursued in the last administration. There are a lot of things I think we ought to know very definitely. How are they going to spread the \$91 million we gave them last week? I wish, under our new foreign policy, and I say this in all seriousness, that you would figure it out so that we can put this thing through one funnel instead of having the Agriculture Department giving away \$100 million this week and the Foreign Affairs Committee giving away \$90 million to some of the same people last

week. That is a serious statement. I do not mean it facetiously.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman expresses some doubt. Might I suggest that we conservative Republicans are showing you liberal Democrats how it really should be done. Perhaps we will take it over there, maybe we will bake it for them if they want it baked, put butter on it, and make sandwiches out of it, too.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Is the gentleman as a Republican maintaining that his party is more efficient in giving away money than we Democrats?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not any more efficient. We are just wasting more than you did.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Let us get back to this bill for a moment. It does not say anything about paying the freight. But some agency is going to pull some money out of a hat and pay the freight in spite of the language of the bill. It specifically says that the wheat shall be delivered on board vessels at American ports, it does not say anything about paying the freight, yet when the committee comes before the Rules Committee for a rule on the bill they say that we are going to pay the freight. I do not know what they are going to pay it out of. Are we going to pay it out of the \$90 million we gave them last week or out of some other pocket?

As the representatives of the taxpayers of this country, and we have made them suffer in late years, before we pass these bills we ought to know exactly what we are going to do, what these things are going to cost, and what pocket it is going to come out of.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, maybe it would be worth while to present a little of the background of this emergency food shortage in Pakistan which nobody likes, but which is one of the hard facts with which we are faced in the present world. I was a member of a subcommittee consisting of four Members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs which made a study of conditions in that part of the world during the Easter recess at the suggestion of the State Department and the Director of Mutual Security.

First, consider Pakistan itself. As you know, it was formed by the splitting of India in 1947, 6 years ago, when India and Pakistan were given their independence, but chose to stay within the British Commonwealth. Pakistan is a fabulous country in several respects. First, it really consists of two countries, 1,000 miles apart. There is only one thing that the people of the two parts of Pakistan have in common, and that is a common religion. They are Muslims. West Pakistan is in the northwest part of the Indian Peninsula, and East Pakistan is in the northeast part, at the head of the Bay of Bengal, further east than Calcutta.

They speak several different languages. The people in the west section speak predominantly a Sanskrit language, Urdu and those in the eastern section speak Bengali. The only language they can all speak in their Cabinet meetings is English. They speak it well, because it was taught in the schools they attended when this subcontinent was under Britain.

Their economies do not complement each other at all, although the economy of each section complements that of India. For example, Pakistan produces cotton, but it does not have many textile mills, so its cotton has to be transported down into Bombay, in India, to be processed there into textiles. Then India ships the textiles abroad and she gets the foreign exchange, even though the raw material was produced in Pakistan. In eastern Pakistan they produce jute but they do not have jute mills. So the jute is sent from East Pakistan to Calcutta, India, processed into burlap and bagging, sold abroad, and the foreign exchange again comes to India.

Pakistan has few natural resources such as minerals. There have been discovered no substantial deposits of coal or iron or oil in Pakistan although there are rich resources in India. So Pakistan has neither adequate raw materials nor manufactured goods to sell abroad in order to get foreign exchange, a jam like the present food shortage, she has to get grain from abroad. But the countries that could supply her with grain will accept only dollars in return. She does not have the dollars, and she has no way of earning the dollars, and we will not take her rupees. That is the basic economic background.

Pakistan, historically, has exported small quantities of grain. The Pakistanis admit with great chagrin that after partition in 1947 and during India's drought of 2 years ago, they were overconfident and instead of storing up their 2 or 3 or 4 percent of grain surplus, they exported it in order to buy foreign commodities. They did not anticipate they would be faced with anything like the present shortage.

What were the reasons for the food shortage? There are several. First, the Pakistanis on the whole are not as good farmers as those who previously farmed much of the best land, and who went to the Indian side in the partition. The main province from the standpoint of food in Pakistan is the Province of Punjab. Punjab means 5 rivers, because there are 5 rivers entering the area, 2 coming from or through India and 3 through Kashmir. They are the source of water supply for irrigation. Not a one arises in Pakistan. They all flow into Pakistan from India and Kashmir, and you know that possession of Kashmir is disputed by Pakistan and India. Part of the original Punjab province split off and went to India. The remainder is the bread basket of West Pakistan, and the best farmers there were the Sikhs, people of the Sikh religion, and the second best farmers, best in carrying on intensive cultivation of the soil, were the Hindus. In the partition, most Sikhs and Hindus left their

farms and went to India. That left the Pakistanis, who previously had specialized more in grazing and in being soldiers. Most of the soldiers in the British armies of the former India were Punjabis. In the past they had not been so active as the Hindus in intensive farming.

Practical evidence of this fact was the peculiar tax system. Under the British, for decades and decades land taxes were not levied on our basis of so much per acre, they were levied on the historical amount of rice or wheat that was produced annually on a given piece of land. The taxes the British levied on the Sikhs were higher than those they levied on the Hindus, and those they levied on the Hindus were higher than those on the Pakistanis, even though their farms were just across the road. This is being changed now under the Government of Independent Pakistan. I mention the matter only to show that there was a human factor in the reduction in production of grain. The farmers who took over the land after the division were on the whole not as good as the previous farmers.

The overriding cause, however, is that beginning 2 years ago there has been an awful drought, worst in the area's history, plus locusts. Some of us were there, and we saw the condition of the land, of the animals, and of the human beings. Normally about half of their production is from irrigated land and about half they raise during the summer monsoon season and in the rainfall areas. The summer crops are sorghums and millets, but not wheat which is planted in the fall and harvested in May.

This drought began 2 years ago, and they were not too anxious at first, but before the end of last year they had to import 800,000 tons of grain. They paid for all of that except for \$15 million worth, which they got as a loan from the American Export-Import Bank. They obtained 150,000 tons of wheat that way. The rest, 650,000 tons of grain, they had to pay for with such foreign exchange as they had and by bartering jute, cotton and rice for wheat. But as you all know the world price of cotton has dropped about 55 percent in the last year and a half, and of jute has dropped between 50 and 60 percent. So their means of securing imports have shriveled through forces over which they had no control.

This explains why they cannot get a loan now, as India did. Their reserves of foreign exchange were all but exhausted in getting through the drought of last year. They do not now have any reserves of grain in their granaries.

They hold about \$191 million in foreign currency, total. Their paper currency has to have a reserve of \$182 million to back it up. That leaves only \$9 million of hard currency to play with to keep their foreign trade going, to serve as a revolving fund. They cannot reduce their holdings of foreign currency, sound currency, below \$182 million, without wrecking their own local currency system, which would throw them into

inflation and make their problems even more difficult.

During the drought of last year, they used what reserves of grain and foreign exchange they had and did not ask us for help, except for that loan. They thought they could carry it through. They are a proud, self-reliant people. But the drought continued—even worse this year than last year. Between 18 and 20 percent fewer acres were planted this year. They could not plow the land, and it was useless to plant the seed. When they cut down by a fifth the ground that was planted and then had a greatly reduced crop from the remainder because of the drought, you see what they are up against.

They have obtained \$5 million worth of wheat from Canada and \$10 million from Australia. You may well ask why we cannot give them a loan the same as we gave India. The hard fact is that they do have to get at least 700,000 tons more of wheat, and they have to get it immediately or else there will be mass starvation and riots and disorder, which will be in nobody's interest except the Kremlin's. If they had to use the little foreign currency they still have and wrecked the stability of their own currency, that would reduce their borrowing power to nothing, and they do need to retain some borrowing power if they are to do anything about the long-term problem of increasing food production. That, too, is complicated.

Perhaps I can give a more birdseye view of it. I said a moment ago there are five rivers flowing into Pakistan from areas they do not control. Two of these rivers come from or through India. India also has great dry areas that she wants to bring under cultivation through irrigation.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Is this Pakistan a new country?

Mr. JUDD. It is. It was just organized in 1947.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Is the country split? Is there an intervening space between the two parts of the country?

Mr. JUDD. The two parts of the country are 1,000 miles apart. There is no food shortage in east Pakistan, which grows and eats rice mainly. The food shortage is in west Pakistan, which grows and eats mostly wheat.

Mr. NICHOLSON. So one part of Pakistan is all right, but we are appropriating for the other part?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, this wheat is all for west Pakistan. East Pakistan does not have a food shortage.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I wonder if the gentleman would agree with me that if we have to perform this painful operation of giving away of our substance, would it not be better if it were handled through the Committee on Foreign Affairs instead of having the Foreign Affairs Committee come in, as it did last week with a charity bill, and then the

Committee on Agriculture coming in this week with another one?

Mr. JUDD. That is not in my province to determine, sir. The gentleman could discuss that with the Speaker of the House and with the Parliamentarian. I do not know why this bill was sent to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I was just trying to get an expression of the gentleman's view on the subject.

Mr. JUDD. I was perfectly willing that it be handled by the Committee on Foreign Affairs to the best of our ability because the need is real and great. I must add that I do not regard this as a charity bill for reasons which I will try to point out.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. If the value of this wheat is reduced to dollars at the present market value of wheat, what does it amount to.

Mr. JUDD. If it is reduced to dollars as the CCC has to, in terms of what the CCC paid for it under our price-support system, it amounts to almost \$100 million. At the present market value of wheat it would be 50 cents a bushel or about \$18 million less.

Now, Mr. Speaker, coming back to the two rivers from India. India has lots of dry land in that area. Since these rivers rise in India or flow through India, naturally, she wants their water for her dry areas to raise more food for her own people. So one of the problems that has been in the process of negotiation between the two countries is how to divide the water in these rivers, and how to get water from alternative sources to supply the land in Pakistan that is now and has heretofore been supplied by water from India. The International Bank has had a working party out there studying the whole Indus Basin. Their engineers have come up with an ingenious plan, which our people out there say is sound. It is to hold back water in the rainy season and build link canals to divert water from the larger rivers into riverbeds that would be dry if India took all the water from the two that flow through India.

Of the five rivers, the Indus River is the big one, carrying approximately half of the total flowage and almost half of it runs into the Indian Ocean because there are no storage dams to hold the water back. The rainfall comes during the months of July, August, and September, and not a drop during the other 9 months. They need dams to impound that floodwater in the mountains and let it come down in the canals during the dry season. But it takes money and capital and foreign exchange to build those dams. The International Bank is willing to lend them funds to build those dams and canals so that they can prevent recurrences of this crisis, so that they can develop the whole basin and get their own water and use it for their own lands. But it will make the loan only if the dispute with India is resolved, which the Bank is endeavoring to accomplish. And it cannot make the loan if Pakistan has so exhausted its reserves to

take care of this immediate emergency that its credit is totally destroyed. That is the crux of the matter. We can force them to borrow the money and send them this wheat as a loan, but if we do, we make it impossible for them to cure the situation. And it is sure to be on our doorstep again. Is it not good sense to carry on a program which will enable them to become self-sufficient rather than to give this money as a loan, and then be faced with the same problem next year and the following year, and whenever there is a drought in the years to come? This is the basic reason which convinced our committee we should recommend a grant in this case rather than a loan, and it is the reason why we recommended paying the freight. It is not a matter of their being unwilling to pay the freight. They do not have the capacity to pay the freight without further imperiling the basic stability of their currency or their ability to make necessary loans for development of their irrigation system.

There are larger issues involved. One is humanitarian. These people are hungry, and the American people, whenever they have had a surplus, historically have given of their surplus to help feed hungry people. I believe our people still approve such a course. Another is strategic. I mentioned it the other day during the debate on the Mutual Security bill. If you look at the whole Middle East, on the west flank is Turkey, one bastion or anchor. On the east is Pakistan. In between there are almost 2,000 miles without a single barrier to stop the Soviet Union from moving south, except some mountains. The prize exposed by that gap includes all the oil in the Middle East, and the Suez Canal, and the land bridge across to Africa, which is strategically so important to us as we look ahead to the next 2 or 3 decades. There are only these two anchors on which we can build or depend; Turkey on that side and Pakistan on this side. It seems to me that it does not make good sense to put billions of dollars into Europe and leave this side door open in such a way that it could only tempt the Soviet Union to move into that area.

I want to make one further point—urgency. If this aid is not given quickly, so that the people of Pakistan, who have just finished, or who are just finishing their wheat harvest, know that they do not have to stretch that inadequate harvest over 12 months, but can start using now what they have, with the assurance that through the rest of the year there will be grain coming from the United States, it is certain there are going to be food riots and disorders. People riot rather than starve. With food riots, you will have either a military government and the end of this magnificent effort of a proud, heroic people to build a really democratic form of government in Asia—or you will have chaos, and only one thing can happen. People in despair will turn to those who are at their elbows every minute promising everything under the sun.

It seems to me that our purpose is not just charity. Our purpose is certainly not to try and buy good will. We

have their good will. We are giving lots of aid to those whose good will we do not have. These people have only good will toward us. It seems to me that this is one of the places where our aid is most justified and can do the most good, both to them and, in the long run, to our own well-being and security.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may require to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

(Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, most of the world's people do not know what it is to have too much food. When nature smiles upon the land millions of men, women, and children get just about enough food to keep them satisfied. But when a vital crop fails, as it does all too often, only the fortunate find enough to eat. Others die of starvation.

That situation is only hearsay to most of us in the United States. Very few living Americans have had the heart-rending experience of watching a child waste away for want of a mouthful of bread.

We are blessed with the opposite problem: too much food. Often, especially in recent years, we have produced greater crops than we can consume. But we prefer it that way, and our Government buys up the excess quantities to be sure that our farmers will not go bankrupt when the bottom drops out of their market. We buy and store that excess food so the Nation will always have a prosperous farm community ready to produce this food when we do need it.

The problem of scarcity and the problem of surplus has a logical meeting ground.

Fortunately for those who starve, the people of this Nation have always been happy to share the bountiful fare of their table with their friends overseas. President Eisenhower is asking us to do that with a million tons of surplus wheat for the people of Pakistan. He has urged haste because a stomach can stay empty only just so long.

Wheat is the major source of food for the 75 million people in Pakistan. For 2 successive years droughts have destroyed the crop. When the crop fails starvation stalks the land unless sufficient quantities of wheat can be brought into the country. But the young Pakistan Government, faced with myriad financial problems, cannot buy enough wheat to keep its people alive. So it has turned to this Nation for help.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure there is not a Member of this House who will question the humanitarian need for this grant. But there is another issue.

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles said last month, shortly after his trip to the Middle East and south Asia, that he was firmly convinced of the desirability of this grant for strategic reasons.

He pointed out that Pakistan borders Communist China and from its northern boundary one can see the Soviet Union. It flanks Iran and the Middle East and guards the Khyber Pass, often an inva-

sion route from the north into the subcontinent. He argued further that Pakistan and the United States have stood side by side in most United Nations debates and that Pakistan was a tower of strength on the Japanese Treaty.

After his recent visit to the Near and Middle East, Mr. Dulles stated further, and I quote:

One of my clearest impressions was that of the outstanding and sincere friendliness which the leaders of Pakistan feel for the United States. I was greatly impressed with their understanding of world problems. I am convinced that they will resist the menace of communism as their strength permits.

I sincerely urge the Congress to bolster that strength in this time of world crisis. I urge you to vote in favor of this bill, H. R. 5659, and, by so doing, tell the people of Pakistan that we in the United States are solicitous for the welfare of our friends.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I am wondering how many people in this House are interested in the financial security of our own currency and our own Nation instead of in the financial security and the imperiling of the currency in Pakistan.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the very learned and forthright gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]. They are not out of line with the remarks I am about to make myself, very briefly.

Mr. Speaker, these problems are always perplexing. I think I realize as fully as anyone here that the situation in the world is so fluid that almost anything can happen. But I have long been convinced—and I repeat for the “ump-teenth” time on the floor of this House—that Russia neither wants war nor peace, but she wants to bleed us white economically and then take over in the ensuing chaos and confusion which follows the destruction of our economy.

We are continuously playing into her hands. I am not setting myself up to say that under this situation it is wrong to give this surplus wheat to Pakistan. Why, of course, the humane aspect, the objective of charity, appeals to all of us. I want to go along with that. I think I could go along, possibly, although somewhat reluctantly, with this proposal of giving away \$100 million worth of wheat under the proper restrictions. And bear in mind now, you are not giving away a surplus product that you have already paid for, because this bill provides that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be reimbursed from the United States Treasury for the most of this wheat. So you are going to give a hundred million dollars away. It is going out of the Treasury of the United States. Let us not fool ourselves about that.

In other words, we are still giving away the taxpayers' money, but further, as I understood the testimony before the

Rules Committee and as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] referred to a moment ago, we not only propose to give the wheat but we propose to deliver it to them, transportation charges paid. Of course we have all heard that old story—and I tell it again with no reflection upon the Pakistan Government or the people of Pakistan—the story of the old fellow who was starving to death and who was being hauled down the road in a wagon. Some good Samaritan—and we have lots of them in this House and in this country—stopped and said: “Where are you taking him?” The answer was, “I am taking him to the poorhouse; he was going to starve to death; he wanted to go, he was voluntarily going.” The good Samaritan said: “That is not necessary; I have a wagonload of corn here. I will just give him some of this corn.” Then the old fellow rose up from the wagon bed, you remember, and asked: “Is it shelled?”

Now we are going to “shell” it, and we are going to deliver it transportation paid. Why should we do that, Mr. Chairman? Is it not enough that we give the wheat without paying the transportation charges? I want to talk to my friends on the left, Republican side, for a moment. I have been charged with being conservative. You used to be charged with being conservative, too, but something has happened. As my learned colleague pointed out here a moment ago when we Democrats did this for India last year I stood in the well of the House—you can look it up in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—and said that we were setting a precedent that was going to give us trouble in the future. But the New Deal, my friends, did a horrible thing, they required the recipient country, India, to pay the transportation charges on that wheat. The new administration with a new foreign policy is going to outdo the old New Deal administration; the new administration is going to deliver the wheat to Pakistan transportation free, we are going to pay the freight charges—about \$20 million. The testimony before the Rules Committee was to the effect that one of the reasons that we should pay the freight on this was so that some of our steamship companies could get something out of it. If we are going to pay the freight, even though it costs twice as much to ship it in American bottoms as it does in foreign bottoms, maybe we should go the whole way and help our own American shipping interests a little. What I am complaining about here is the proposal to further add to the national debt and deficit spending to the tune of \$20 million freight charges on wheat that we are giving away. Certainly this is another new and dangerous precedent in our foreign-aid program.

At the proper time in the reading of this bill for amendment I am going to offer an amendment providing that the transportation charges shall be paid by the beneficiary and thereby we will save just a little insignificant sum of \$20 million. Of course, that does not amount to anything now when we are giving away 6 billions or more annually to foreign countries.

But you know, I have some folks down in my district who think 20 million is a sizable amount of money, particularly when it is taken out of their pockets for taxes. Twenty million dollars would mean an awful lot to my taxpayers if I could be a party toward saving it for them.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude where I began, it would mean a lot to the stability of this Government if we could put the brakes on somewhere along the line and try to preserve this last haven of refuge of a free people. When you destroy the economy of these free people you have destroyed everything.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I want to ask the gentleman this question: My recollection may be faulty, but did not we vote last year to sell on terms of credit, not to give, to India? Am I at fault in my memory?

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman is technically correct. We accepted some notes to make it a little more palatable.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman from Mississippi will recall that the proposition first came in as this bill comes in today as a gift.

Mr. COLMER. That is my recollection and I am sure that is the recollection of the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to conclude this with any apology. I do not enjoy getting up here and opposing these things continuously, but I do feel my obligation to my people and to my own country to try to protect this country insofar as I can.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the pending bill would make available to the Republic of Pakistan 37 million bushels of wheat from the Commodity Credit Corporation stocks. This will be an outright gift to a friendly nation—a nation whose troops have fought valiantly beside our own in Korea. In the committee report it is pointed out that its purpose is to provide food in a famine-stricken area which is suffering from a terrific drought. The committee reports that the CCC now has on hand 310 million bushels of wheat, acquired from price-support operations, and that we can well afford to spare the amount which it is proposed to give to Pakistan.

But while we are talking about distress resulting from droughts in foreign countries let us not forget that we have disasters caused by prolonged droughts right here in our country. Fortunately, we produce food in great abundance and we do not face famine as such. We have surpluses, not shortages, to deal with.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the time is at hand when there should be a reexamination of our basic policies with respect to use of surpluses accumulated by the Government to alleviate distress and disasters, even when they occur here at home. Are we wedded to a policy of using such surpluses to alleviate suffering only if it occurs in foreign lands?

Just where is the line to be drawn on helping those who, because of no fault of their own, become victims of a disaster such as results from an extreme drought?

Let us not forget that we have droughts right here at home, within the confines of our own Nation.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I just wanted to say this to the gentleman. As he knows, we are giving some consideration to the drought situation in Texas. I wanted to advise him that we are having a meeting of the Committee on Agriculture on Thursday to consider especially the drought situation along the lines that he is discussing at this time.

Mr. FISHER. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution. He certainly has been most sympathetic and considerate with respect to the condition I have described. The gentleman has held meetings in the past, and I know that his understanding of the situation has been current and that he recognizes the seriousness of the situation.

Right at this time there is a considerable area in southwest Texas, for example, that is suffering from a drought condition the severity of which has not been experienced in recorded history. It is taking a terrific toll. That stricken area is located in the heart of one of the Nation's leading sheep-, goat-, and cattle-producing sections. This drought, of devastating proportions, has been going on for 4 continuous years, even longer in some spots. There are growers in that area who have been forced to feed every head of their livestock for every day of the year for a period of more than 3 years. I can give you their names and addresses.

During that period feed prices have remained high, while livestock prices have in general dropped considerably. Credit has been exhausted in many instances, and a most desperate situation has developed. It all means inevitable bankruptcy for many of the sturdiest citizens of the land unless something is done to cushion the impact which has befallen them.

It is because of the existence of those conditions that I raise the question now of policy in the use of surpluses to alleviate such suffering; and since we are being asked to give 37 million bushels of wheat to help people who are victims of a drought in a friendly foreign country, I think this is the appropriate time to raise the question of just where the line on this type of Government benevolence is to be drawn.

The condition I have described can be alleviated, at least, to some extent. While those people are not prone to lean on a benevolent Government, they find great difficulty, just as I do, in reconciling their plight with the program and the policy which is represented in this legislation.

It is true that we have a surplus of wheat. At this time it amounts to 310 million bushels, and it cost the American taxpayers \$837 million. The CCC

also has in storage 595 million tons of cottonseed cake and meal, also acquired from price-support operations, at a cost of \$36 million. The CCC also owns 242 million bushels of corn, which cost the Government \$389 million. All of this, as well as other surpluses, was paid for by our taxpayers, including those who are striving for survival in our own drought-stricken areas. It is inevitable that the Government suffer some losses from these operations.

The cottonseed products, heavy in protein values, can be acquired by our citizens. But in my own area the price is virtually prohibitive, at \$59 per ton at the places of storage. The buyer must sack and transport the feed, and in some instances there is some reprocessing to be done. With the price of livestock at present levels and with most of their credit already used up, the average feeder simply cannot afford to pay the price. At the same time, these hard-pressed victims of this disaster are told that this same feed can be bought by foreigners at \$52 per ton. It is explained that this is in keeping with world prices and that to reduce the cost to domestic consumers that much would break the market in this country and involve the Government in unacceptable losses on its investment in cottonseed products.

Mr. Speaker, last year the Government did go to the aid of drought-stricken areas with the hay program whereby the consumers were afforded the privilege of buying hay at lower-than-market costs, and I understand this venture cost Uncle Sam around \$7 million. But what is that in comparison with the cost to us of the 37 million bushels of wheat that we are asked to give away by this bill today at a cost of nearly \$100 million?

Again I say this entire disaster-relief policy needs a reexamination to determine where the line of solicitude should be drawn. If this benevolent policy is to be followed, is it to be limited only to those who suffer from droughts in foreign countries? Why not make surplus feeds available to drought victims in our own country, not on a giveaway basis but at a price in keeping with conditions that exist—at least as low as or lower than is offered to foreign buyers? And why not think about long-term credit arrangements which would enable our citizens to work and grow themselves out of the situation which this disaster has brought upon them? Actually, a realistic relief program should, over the long pull, cost the Government very little.

This legislation should serve to remind all of us that drought victims are not to be found only in Pakistan. We have victims right here at home—victims who are helping pick up the check which makes this gift to Pakistan possible.

I am delighted that the chairman of the Agriculture Committee has called a meeting on Thursday to consider this entire problem.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not hesitate to come up here and speak

on this matter. When this matter came before the Committee on Rules, I was inclined to vote for it. Coming from a race of people, from Scotland, I would be more or less willing to give away some of the material that was supposed to support my family and my country. But, I looked up in the World Almanac where Pakistan was, and I could not find it. So I asked my chairman on the committee and he very graciously pointed out that Pakistan was over here and Pakistan was over there, and in between, 2,000 miles away, was India; I mean, both parts of Pakistan were 2,000 miles away from each other.

Then the gentleman from Virginia called your attention to it. He is a very brilliant man, in the estimation of everybody here in the House. He, like the gentleman from Mississippi, wants to know how long we can spend \$167 million at a time for someone that we do not know exists and continue to pay our own freight.

I am not asking you the question; I am simply asking you if you can say in your own mind where Pakistan is. True, somebody is starving. They have been starving since the time of Christ, who said, "The poor ye have with you always." We will always have them. I would not be surprised but that Pakistan would get along all right if we did not appropriate this money. The gentleman from Minnesota said, and if I am mistaken he can correct me, that the Kremlin will take charge of it. The Kremlin did not give anything to India; it was the United States that did it. The Kremlin is not giving anything to Pakistan. As a matter of fact, all the Kremlin is doing is giving the world trouble. The Kremlin has forgotten that our Government gave them wheat when they were starving. I think it is about time we woke up to the fact that we should start looking out for the United States of America. I think it would be an awfully good thing for us to do, because we are gradually getting to the place where we will not be able to give anybody anything.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman mentioned his difficulty in locating Pakistan. I would like to ask the gentleman if he knows where Cambodia is.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I have no more idea where Cambodia is than Pakistan, and I have tried to look it up.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I am not sure I understood my friend correctly, but I thought he said that I had suggested that the Kremlin would supply this aid if we did not. I made no such statement, I think. I said that if there are disorder and food riots as a result of starvation in that country, the disorder will be taken advantage of by the Kremlin so that it might be able to take over the country,

or more likely, the weakening of Pakistan would encourage the Kremlin to move down through the gap between Pakistan and Turkey. Starving people will go with who promises them something. The United States can deliver the aid it promises and we do deliver; the Kremlin makes headway in areas where there is unrest and confusion, because of its extravagant promises. People in despair have no way of resisting promises that sound glittering, even though they are totally fraudulent.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I accept the apology of the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there is any Member of this House who is not deeply sympathetic toward any action that would help God's unfortunates and the poverty-stricken people of the world. However, it does not seem that the committees present these cases to us in such a way that we understand what they are all about. I for one am awfully tired of hearing, every time we come up with a piece of legislation on these programs, that "Unless you acquiesce the Soviets will move in." What do we have to fear from the Soviets? Let us discontinue this talk and get down to practical, realistic humanitarian thinking on this matter.

I cannot understand why the Committee on Foreign Affairs did not bring in this appropriation in their mutual security legislation. This matter has been under consideration for some time. It rightfully belongs in the Foreign Affairs Committee and not the Agriculture Committee. If Foreign Affairs Committee recommended \$71 million in the appropriations bill why did they not bring in \$171 million to take care of Pakistan wheat.

Then the other question that I would like to have answered is the distribution of this wheat to Pakistan. How is it going to be handled? I presume it will be handled as it has been in the past. We will send \$100 million worth of wheat over there and pay the freight and the Government of Pakistan will take over the wheat upon delivery and in turn will sell the wheat to the people. They will then impound the money to be used for purposes of economic rehabilitation of that country, and to balance their budget and to stabilize their currency. That is what is questionable in my mind; how is this wheat to be distributed. That is why I am concerned about this matter as to whether or not the people who are hungry and starving will actually get the wheat. Whether the starving people who have no money to buy will get the wheat is what is troubling me. Certainly the American people want to help these people and also we want to be sure it will reach the hungry people for whom it is intended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, this matter of trying to help out these friendly people in Pakistan has been under consideration by responsible people in the Government for a long time. It has been very carefully considered. Let me remind you that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd], I think, has spoken very well of the situation in Pakistan. He has clearly demonstrated their need.

It is true this bill provides for the replenishing of the money to come out of Commodity Credit Corporation, but when this matter was discussed there was question as to which agency of the Government would be charged with it, and that had to be resolved. Beyond that, and let us just be frank about it, what I am going to say here will be better said by others—but I do not want a misconception to get abroad about this matter. And possibly I should not want the people of Pakistan to think that we are giving them something that is going to go to waste anyway. But the fact is, we have wheat running out of our ears. There is scheduled to follow this measure, if we do not take up the trip-leasing bill next, a proposal to alleviate the tremendous cutback in wheat quotas. Why? Because the surplus stocks of wheat are going up by leaps and bounds. We are talking now, if we have not already done it, about putting wheat in ships on the Hudson River. You know what happens when you put wheat in a steel ship in the Hudson River. In a little while it is not going to be too good. In other words, it would not be very good public relations for this great country of ours to hold on to a tremendous surplus supply of food grain, and at the same time let a friendly people starve. That is exactly what the situation will be.

With all respect to those who talk about the fiscal situation at home, may I say I have been taking quite a bit of heat on that score as the appropriation bills have come along, and I have been willing to get up and take it. But I do not believe this bill involves that consideration because, as I say, it has to do with helping a friendly nation with a resource that we have in such quantities that we do not know what to do with it. In the final analysis, I do not believe this bill will cost us anything like \$100 million. So I say we should go on with the adoption of this rule and to the enactment of this bill with such amendments as may be deemed to properly meet whatever situation exists.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. Will the gentleman try to explain to us whether this is a gift or a loan, and after this action is taken, how the wheat is going to be distributed and where they are going to collect the money, and what they are going to do with the money they collect in Pakistan

after they sell the wheat? We would like to know some of these things.

Mr. BARDEN. These folks advocating this bill have been talking an hour on this subject, and they are suppose to know something about it. They have not given us that information so how can you expect me to do it in 5 minutes? I am also interested in getting the information to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. GAVIN. I have great respect for the gentleman. I realize that he knows a great deal.

Mr. BARDEN. I thank the gentleman for the compliment.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to this matter. I have listened to Dr. Judd, my friend from Minnesota, who is a most delightful gentleman. I must express my disagreement with him. To follow the policy outlined by him would be for us to assume responsibility for a good portion of the world and everywhere some group threatened to riot to give them millions of dollars. That, to my mind, might be construed as placing a premium on rioting.

I do not know whether this proposal is on the basis of charity or, as the distinguished majority leader says, because we have so much of everything we must give it away in order to produce some more of the same thing; nor do I know just how many have in their minds that if we do not give this wheat the Kremlin will move in. But I want to say this. I have had an urge to say it for several days around here. When I asked one of the responsible men on the Foreign Affairs Committee handling the foreign-aid bill how much a particular country was going to get under that \$5 billion bill passed here Friday his reply to me was, "That was classified information." When you are giving away the American taxpayer's money, his duly elected Representative should not be given an answer of that kind. He is going to want the whole truth, and will not be satisfied with a little classified information. The term "classified information" is a high-sounding term brought up here by the State Department which in plain English means secret information. Five billion dollars is five thousand million dollars of taxpayers' money. That is no secret.

I believe I am as charitable as any man in this House. I was raised in that atmosphere. I have never changed my attitude in that regard. But I have never regarded myself as being commissioned as a Member of this body to come here to give away my folks' money in any such manner as we have been called upon to do—Friday, five billion—today, one hundred million. That is too fast and furious for me.

I do not think there is a Member in this House who does not know that there are limitations in the Constitution as to what we can levy taxes for. I think we are all aware of that.

Now, what are we going to do? We will give this away and give that away, and then pay day is coming. I have seen the time when this has happened; a lot of your taxpayers will not be able

to pay the last year's taxes, because the year in which they are living has been one in which they have had reverses. And for the very money that we are giving away the tax collector will move up, foreclose that man's home, and put him and his family out in the street.

You can laugh at that, my friends, but it will not be funny when someone asks you if you took part in making that possible.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I was not laughing at the gentleman. I was wondering whether he would, if we substituted cotton for wheat, make the same speech.

Mr. BARDEN. I certainly would, and my actions and my record will prove that, sir.

Mr. SCOTT. I assure the gentleman I am glad to hear it.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman is not just glad to hear it; he knew it all the time, so far as that is concerned. My statements now are no different from those I have been making for the past several years.

If you are going to give away \$100 million of taxpayers' money then, all right. You can do it, but I am conscientiously opposed to it. I love the people of Pakistan and the people all over the world just as much as does anybody in this House. If we want to reach down into our own pockets and give away something that belongs to ourselves then O.K. But I will not take what belongs to someone else and give it away to foreign countries all over the world. I cannot go along with that.

The Constitution of the United States says in plain English:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

I accept that language, I took an oath to support that language—and regardless of how much I personally would like to help Pakistan I do not think and no one has dared argue that the purpose for which this \$100 million worth of wheat is to be used comes within the limits placed upon us by the Constitution, whether we like it or not.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include with my remarks several communications that I have in connection with House Resolution 231. They are samples of many others that I have received.

THE ESTONIAN NATIONAL
COMMITTEE IN THE UNITED STATES,
New York, N. Y., May 12, 1953.

The Honorable CHARLES J. KERSTEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: We have learned with great pleasure that you have submitted to the House of

Representatives Resolution No. 231 asking for the creation of a committee to conduct a complete investigation of the seizure of the Baltic States by Soviet Russia.

Your resolute step is greatly appreciated by all Estonians.

Needless to say that we are willing to produce any available evidence required in this matter.

In this connection we enclose for your information a copy of our communication to the President of the United States of May 9, expressing our attitude toward the Soviet so-called peace offensive.

Respectfully,

JUHAN VASAR,
President.

UNITED LITHUANIAN
RELIEF FUND OF AMERICA, INC.,
Brooklyn, N. Y., June 11, 1953.

Hon. CHARLES J. KERSTEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KERSTEN: Please accept our heartfelt appreciation for introducing to the 83d Congress House Resolution 231 to alleviate the suffering of the Baltic Republics.

I hope that you will succeed and carry this bill through as you did wonderful work in securing funds for escapees.

With high esteem, I am
Respectfully yours,
Rt. Rev. JOSEPH B. KONCIUS,
National President.

LATVIAN NATIONAL CENTER
IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Boston, Mass., May 13, 1953.

Hon. CHARLES J. KERSTEN,
Fifth District, Wisconsin,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Getting acquainted with your resolution introduced in the House of Representatives on January 14, 1953, and with your accompanying letter with comments on it, the Latvian National Center in the United States, whose principal aim is its fight against communism and the liberation of Latvia, wants to express deep appreciation, sympathy, and admiration to the unfailing strategy stressed by you in your splendid resolution.

This resolution, if passed, is a hopeful sign that the first victims of the Communist tyranny—the Baltic States—will regain their lost freedom again. Knowing communism, we are absolutely convinced that world communism can be, and must be, destroyed. Because that is the only way to freedom and peace.

Bearing this in mind and desiring to be an active member in the American Nation's fight against communism, the Latvian National Center in the United States is willing to support your resolution by all means, and hereby offers to you, sir, and to the Congress, a close cooperation.

The Latvian National Center has skilled groups in Sweden and West Germany to get in touch with the men of the Latvian underground resistance movement behind the Iron Curtain, as well as skilled persons in the United States and in other countries to further successful psychological war against communism.

We would be able to submit (1) information on events in Soviet-occupied Latvia; (2) statements and other documents concerning terror and genocide in Soviet-occupied Latvia; (3) ideas, as well as practical suggestions, to fight communism, especially in the Baltic States.

It is understood that we would be able to do all this only if we can facilitate our skilled men with necessary means, lack of which until now has been the biggest obstacle to our activities in the field of intelligence. However, we have done our best, and we hope that some day a better chance will come.

As to ideological warfare against commu-

nism, we are in full readiness to develop full-scale activities.

Very sincerely yours,

VALDEMARS LAMBERGS,
Member of Executive Board, Public
Relations, Latvian National Center
in United States.

COMMITTEE FOR A FREE LATVIA,
New York, N. Y., May 15, 1953.

Hon. CHARLES J. KERSTEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REPRESENTATIVE: With reference to Resolution 231 submitted by you to the House of Representatives to create a Select Committee To Conduct a Full and Complete Investigation and Study of the Seizure and Forced Incorporation of the Baltic States by the U. S. S. R., I have the honor on behalf of the Committee for a Free Latvia to thank you and to express our conviction that the examination will prove that Soviet claims are only a shameless assertion to cover a ruthless violation of the international law.

You may be sure that Latvians will be watching further development with true and great interest.

We will be only too glad to supply you with information and materials that are in our possession what concerns the above matter.

Yours sincerely,
Dr. VILIS MASENS,
Chairman.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have thought much about this thing. I believe that my record for economy during the last Congress is about as good as anybody's in the House. At least 1 national organization placed me among the 60 who had a perfect voting record for economy out of 531 Members of the House and Senate; so I am not approaching this in any light vein. To me there seems to be an interest above a purely selfish one. There is the appeal of the humanitarian interest and there is an approach from the undisputed interest of the Nation.

First of all, it seems to me that here today on this floor we have got to realize that in the Far East there are only 2 countries on which we can rely, and 1 of them is Pakistan. Whether or not you vote for this wheat today is not going to make a difference in Pakistan's love for the United States. Even though she does not get this wheat she is not going to turn against the United States, for she has gone on record and been on record as being against the Kremlin ever since the nation of Pakistan came into being.

Pakistan has a well-trained standing army that guards some of the very important passes through the mountains. Pakistan is becoming of increasing importance to the West. I say that in her you certainly have one ally on whom we can depend if we had to call on her. I am not so sure about the rest of them, but I do feel pretty sure about Pakistan.

In the second place about the question of transportation that was raised by my colleague; that is complicated by the Mutual Security Act. The Mutual Security Act requires that this food and relief material—50 percent of it must be carried in American bottoms. The Mutual Security Act is permanent legislation; it is mandatory under the act that we carry 50 percent of this wheat in

American bottoms; and we must pay for it in American dollars.

Of course, Pakistan could carry it in foreign bottoms if it were necessary, but they do not have the dollars with which to pay this carrying charge. It would cost \$20 million, as I understand, if this grain were carried in American bottoms, but if it were carried in foreign bottoms it would cost only about \$10 million.

They do not have the dollars. They are in the sterling area and they can carry it if they pay carriage charges in sterling. But they have no dollars, and such situations have not worked very well in other similar cases in the past. Remember, again, that the Mutual Security Act makes it mandatory that 50 percent of this grain go in American bottoms. That is the problem that is presented to you, how to carry this wheat to Pakistan. They simply do not have the dollars or the exchange with which to carry it in American bottoms and pay for it in American dollars.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired; all time has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5659) to provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5659, with Mr. ELLSWORTH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has already stated, this is a matter which has received a great deal of consideration in the executive branch of the Government; it has been the subject of thorough hearings in the Committee on Agriculture, and I do not believe there is reason for anyone to think that it has not been considered fully and that all aspects of it have not been thoroughly studied. The matter comes to the Congress through a message from the President of the United States asking that appropriate legislation be introduced to provide for the transfer of not to exceed 1 million tons of wheat to Pakistan, of which 700,000 tons is expected to be used to alleviate famine and starvation and not to exceed 300,000 tons used to build up a reserve if necessary.

The question has been raised, and I think properly, as to why this legislation comes from the Committee on Agriculture rather than the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The answer to that is that this is a measure which deals with commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation and for that reason it was referred to the committee which has jurisdiction over that matter.

If you will read the bill, you will find it shows clearly what disposition will be made of this wheat and the conditions under which it is to be delivered to the people of Pakistan. As to the situation which now exists there, let me say that Pakistan is a nation normally self-sufficient so far as the production of wheat is concerned. But it has been suffering for the past 2 years from a most severe drought so that while the normal production of wheat in that country is about 147 million bushels, production was reduced this year to 115 million bushels and further reduced this year to 103 million bushels. That is a particularly serious situation because wheat constitutes the main item of diet of the people of Pakistan. Even in normal times they were just barely over the margin as far as production of wheat was concerned. With normal crops they have an exportable surplus of only 3 or 4 percent. So it can readily be seen that when we have 2 successive drought years, as has been the case in Pakistan, it very seriously and immediately affects the food supply of the country.

The question has been raised here as to whether or not this is a gift, and if so what is its purpose? I think that that question very easily can be answered by saying that it is a gift to a friendly nation, a nation which is on our side, as far as the current world situation is concerned; not a gift for the purpose of buying good will, but a gift for the purpose of strengthening an ally and a friend. The strategic position of Pakistan has been pointed out already by the gentleman from Minnesota. Others have spoken of the splendid army that they have in Pakistan—a strong Pakistan is a source of strength to the free nations of the world. But a country whose people are ravaged by famine, by shortages of food, is not a strong country or a dependable ally not because the spirit is not willing but because the flesh is weak.

Now, the provisions in this bill state very briefly the terms upon which this assistance is to be granted. It provides that no wheat shall be delivered except under certain conditions, those conditions are set out in section 3 of the bill. They provide, among other things, that this wheat must be distributed to the people of Pakistan without discrimination and it must be supplied free of cost to persons who are unable to purchase it. It provides that its distribution must be given full and continuous publicity as being assistance furnished by the people of the United States. It provides also that we may have representatives there to observe without restriction the distribution of the commodity. Then there is a further provision which will answer some of the questions that have been asked on this matter today, and that is What is to become of the funds that are collected when this wheat is sold?

Those funds are to be deposited in a special account and they must be used in bringing about increased food production in the country. Pakistan is a country with a small amount of rain-

fall. Much of their agriculture is under irrigation, and it is my understanding that the purpose for which these funds will be used will be to assist in developing irrigation works and in improving methods of agricultural production in that country so as to increase their ability to produce their own food.

Certainly no more constructive way could be found for using those funds. All of this money will be used for that purpose except 5 percent which will be allocated to the Government of the United States to pay our expenses in overseeing the administration of the program in that country.

Pakistan also agrees that if this wheat is delivered that it will pursue all appropriate measures to reduce its relief needs and to increase production and supply and improve the distribution of food-stuffs so as to lessen the danger of similar emergencies in the future.

The question has been asked as to whether this is a precedent of any kind. I do not think that any of these relief measures are necessarily precedents. I think we have to deal with every one of them on the basis of the situation that exists at any particular time. In the case of Pakistan the records, if you go back many years as far as weather is concerned, show that they have never had more than 2 successive years of drought, so it is to be anticipated if we take care of this present acute situation, and if they are able to improve their system of food production and distribution, we are not likely to be called upon at any time soon for a similar emergency in Pakistan.

I said in the beginning that this measure had been very carefully considered in the executive branch of the Government. We had before us at the hearings the Secretary of State, who has only lately returned from a trip to Pakistan. We had with us Governor Stassen, the Administrator of the mutual-aid program, who accompanied Secretary Dulles to Pakistan and had an opportunity to study the situation at first hand.

We also had before us Dr. Harry Reed, of Purdue University, one of the best-versed men in agriculture in the United States, who was sent to Pakistan by our Government to personally check up on this situation and ascertain just what it might be as far as the need for wheat was concerned. Dr. Reed spent 3 or 4 weeks in that country. He was accompanied by an associate from Purdue, Dr. Volk, an eminent agronomist. Our agricultural attaché in Pakistan, who had previously made a study of the matter and recommended that we send a quantity of wheat to Pakistan, accompanied them in the study which they made of the situation. So I say that this is a matter which was studied very, very carefully before any request was made of the Congress to take any action.

Now I want to refer to the wheat surplus in this country. We will have on July 1 a wheat carryover of 575 million bushels. The June 10 estimate of wheat production in this country for 1953 calls for 1,132,000,000 bushels of wheat, which will give us a supply for the coming year

of 1,700,000,000 bushels of wheat. It is expected that our normal exports and domestic consumption will take up about 1 billion bushels, so that by July 1, 1954, we will have a carryover of about 700 million bushels. Therefore, we have ample wheat, and I am glad we do, because it is a source of strength to this country. The way we use those supplies can be made a further source of strength to this country. If we do what we are proposing to do in this bill, divert those supplies to a friendly ally which is now in distress, in order to increase the strength of that ally, then I think we are making the best possible use of this bountiful supply of wheat which divine providence has made possible for this country.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I would like to know whether or not the storage facilities in this country are being cramped at this time, whether we need to get this wheat out of this country in order to make room for the wheat that is coming?

Mr. HOPE. Out in the gentleman's district and in my district they are piling wheat on the ground today.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is not saying we should cure a surplus storage problem in this country by giving our wheat and corn and everything else away?

Mr. HOPE. I am saying we have a great deal of wheat in this country, and that the problem of storage is a difficult one.

Mr. GROSS. No doubt about it, but the gentleman is not advocating giving this wheat away to other countries simply because we do not have adequate storage facilities?

Mr. HOPE. I am advocating giving away wheat, of which we have an oversupply, to a friendly nation.

Mr. GROSS. Did not Pakistan sell surplus wheat?

Mr. HOPE. Pakistan has not had any surplus of wheat for 2 years. In normal times Pakistan has an exportable surplus, I understand, of four or five million bushels of wheat.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not true that Pakistan in 1950 or 1951 sold all the surplus wheat she had?

Mr. HOPE. I think they have retained surplus wheat every year.

Mr. GROSS. They retained nothing for safety purposes as against a drought.

Mr. HOPE. Perhaps they did not retain enough.

Mr. GROSS. No, they certainly did not.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. In the event we do not give this wheat to Pakistan, is it likely this wheat would be spoiled and have to be wasted?

Mr. HOPE. There is a question of how long we can keep wheat in storage. We have no wheat that is spoiling now but we have wheat in some pretty poor storage. We have wheat stored in boats on the Hudson River and down on the James River. I do not know how long we can keep wheat in that kind of storage. Of course, I assume the Commodity Credit Corporation is going to do the best job it can to keep that wheat in good condition.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is there not a likely chance that this wheat might spoil, if we do not give it to Pakistan?

Mr. HOPE. There is always a chance that some of our surplus supply of wheat will spoil, if it has to be kept too long. I cannot think of anything much worse than to have food spoiling in this country when there are millions of hungry people in the world.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I ask the gentleman if this is not true, just for the information of the House, that the support price on Saturday of wheat was \$2.36, and it was selling on the open market at \$1.83, and the day before it had been selling at \$1.77 or \$1.78. The reason it jumped up to \$1.83 was because the Government now allows it to be stored on the ground and pays the support price. Is that not true?

Mr. HOPE. That is true.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I ask just one further question, in answer to the gentleman from Iowa, 2 years ago Pakistan had a surplus of 50,000 tons of wheat, which it offered in good neighborliness to sell to India. India at that time refused to buy it. Has it not been true that each year that Pakistan had a surplus, they have carried over some of the wheat until the next year, and also for planting purposes? Is that not true during all the years that they have had a surplus?

Mr. HOPE. That is my understanding.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is it not true it is not possible for Pakistan to carry over a large surplus into the next year because the storage facilities in Pakistan are quite inadequate?

Mr. HOPE. Yes, and also because of the weather conditions, which, I think, make it very difficult to store wheat for long periods.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I would like to get some facts on this. I understand you are giving this wheat to the Pakistan Government?

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. BARDEN. Now, how and at what price does the Pakistan Government make it available to the people who need the wheat to eat?

Mr. HOPE. I think that figure is in the hearings. I do not recall it exactly, but they are not selling it for any purpose of making a profit as I understand it.

Mr. BARDEN. If the gentleman does not know the figures, how could he reach the conclusion that it is not being sold for a profit?

Mr. HOPE. I have seen the figures and I have reached the conclusion from the figures.

Mr. BARDEN. I am glad the gentleman is taking a little longer time because we are getting down to some information now where not a bit of information has been given to the House. You are asking Members to vote on a bill that we really do not know what it is all about.

Mr. HOPE. I am glad to give the gentleman any information I can.

Mr. BARDEN. Is there any provision for the regulation of the price that the people of Pakistan will have to pay the particular administration that happens to be in power?

Mr. HOPE. The bill provides that we are to supervise the distribution of this wheat, and also that the supplies are to be furnished free of cost to all persons who by virtue of circumstances beyond their control are unable to pay for them, and also that the supplies are to be distributed without discrimination to the people of Pakistan.

Mr. BARDEN. Does that mean that the Government sells this wheat to the needy people, or do they give it to those who are starving?

Mr. HOPE. They are giving it to the needy people who cannot afford to pay, and they will sell it to the people who can afford to pay.

Mr. BARDEN. Is there any detailed agreement collateral to this piece of legislation? Does the State Department have any contract with Pakistan that dovetails with this bill that we are passing?

Mr. HOPE. The wheat is not to be delivered to Pakistan until Pakistan enters into an agreement to comply with the conditions that are set out in the bill.

Mr. BARDEN. I will say frankly to the chairman I really think the House is entitled to some of the detailed information. We passed a \$5 billion bill on Friday, and every time someone would ask a question about how much money was going where, it was called classified information.

Mr. HOPE. There is no classified information in this matter that I know of. What does the gentleman want to know?

Mr. BARDEN. I want to know how this wheat that we are parading as a great generous gift from the American people to the needy people of Pakistan is going to reach the people who actually need it. That is exactly what I want to know, and what it is going to cost us.

Mr. HOPE. I thought I had told the gentleman. My time has expired, but I will be glad, under the 5-minute rule, to go into that, if the gentleman desires.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I shall, with great reluctance, support this pending measure. I intend however to support an amendment which will be offered by my colleague from Texas [Mr. POAGE], the effect of which will be to require the Pakistan Government to pay the freight, the ocean freight, on the wheat from here to Karachi.

There is something strange about this situation. I doubt if ever before this

House has faced a situation in all respects similar to the one we now have before us. On the same date, June 16, 1953, these two bills were reported; one by the House Committee on Agriculture, H. R. 5659, and the other by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, H. R. 5710.

When the MSA bill was before the House last week, there was a substantial item in the bill for India and Pakistan, \$94,400,000. We had a right to assume that the members of that great committee on Foreign Affairs had with great diligence and care considered all the pertinent facts and circumstances involved in the unfortunate situation in Pakistan. Actually, the report refers to the food crisis in Pakistan and its points out the fact that last year we provided aid only to the extent of a \$15 million loan to Pakistan, which enabled them to weather the storm and prevent undue hardship in that country.

When the bill came before us, we were not told exactly how many millions of dollars would be available to Pakistan, but we were told that \$94,400,000 would be divided in some fashion between the two countries, India and Pakistan.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The report from the Committee on Foreign Affairs states that Pakistan will get \$27,500,000.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. Judd, a member of the committee, told us that it was classified information. I was told a moment ago by a member of the committee that it was \$27 million, but I was still under the impression that it was classified and therefore I did not quote it for the record. It is in the report, is it?

Mr. JUDD. It is in the report, on page 13.

Mr. VORYS. There is \$109,900,000 for India and \$27,500,000 for Pakistan.

Mr. COOLEY. I am certainly not in error when I say that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] stated before the Committee on Rules that it was classified information.

Mr. JUDD. At that time it was classified, but we got it unclassified. We are at the mercy of the people downtown who come before us and in executive session tell us that certain information is classified.

Mr. COOLEY. I am not objecting to the fact that the information was treated as classified so much as I am to the fact that this problem is, after all, a foreign-policy problem. Although it came to our committee, actually it should have gone to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Affairs should have been given the benefit of the testimony which was offered in our committee room.

I should like for some member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to tell me, or to tell this House now, what it is you know about the situation in Pakistan today that you did not know on the 16th of

June. At that time Mr. Dulles had returned from a 3-day trip to this far-distant country, and he and his associates are the only ones who supplied our committee with any information as to the great hardships in Pakistan.

I voted to report the bill entirely on the strength of ex parte testimony, which had been offered to our committee by Mr. Dulles, Mr. Stassen, and Dr. Harry Reed.

I know that charity is the paramount of all virtues; and actuated and prompted by the impulses of charity, I want to go along with this bill, and I am going to vote for this bill. I am following the dictates of my own conscience and leaning a little to the side of charity.

I am also aware of the fact, as was pointed out by the presiding officer a moment ago, the majority leader, that we do have wheat running out of our ears and our storage houses are bulging. It would not do for us to permit that wheat to deteriorate and to rot here while in a troubled world other people are starving. But it is rather strange that \$100 million should be lopped off of the MSA bill and swung on to this bill when I know that the situation has not drastically changed in the last few days. Mr. Dulles came back. He did not see anybody starving; and I am not unmindful of the fact that they have had periods of famine, that they have had drought, that they need wheat. But I am aware of the fact that we did not give wheat to India when it was proposed by the State Department that it should be given to India. At the time we passed that Indian wheat bill the Democratic Party was accused of being the party of Santa Claus. Now, you look, here comes Santa Claus, Santa Claus brings and delivers his gifts, and that is what it is proposed here that we do, that we take this \$80 million of wheat, load it into a hundred ships and send it into the port of Karachi, deliver it and pay all the freight from our storage bins to the city of Karachi. All right; if we are going to be Santa Claus, let us be Santa Claus, but do not stand here and accuse the Democratic Party of being the party of Santa Claus when in foreign affairs—and this is a clear-cut example of it—you are going us one better.

I have been criticized here for voting to pour millions of dollars down rat-holes in foreign countries, and I am going to vote to put a little more wheat down another rat-hole, but I do so with a clear conscience knowing that we ourselves have an abundance and our allies across the sea who are currently supporting our cause are at least suffering in some degree.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. In order for us to maintain good standing with the people of India does not the gentleman agree with me that any obligations outstanding—and I understand they are all outstanding—by the Indian Government to our Government now for wheat which we let them have some time ago should be canceled?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not think anybody seriously contemplates a repayment by India.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Pakistan and India are side by side.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; and at each other's throats. I would like to suggest to the State Department that perhaps the Secretary and his team should stay in India and Pakistan longer than 3 days.

What about the people of Kashmir? They stand between India on the one side and Pakistan on the other, and perhaps the people of Kashmir do not want to go with either. Nobody has suggested that Kashmir have an opportunity to remain as Kashmir to live side by side with the other nations around her; and I think that Kashmir could support its own economy and could occupy a place among the nations of this world, but Kashmir has not been given a chance to be left alone to run her own affairs. We are prolonging the controversy, giving to India 2 years ago, giving to Pakistan now.

When the Republicans came into power we were told that there was going to be a change. If there has been any change at all the only change that I can see is that you have changed your minds, and in the field of foreign aid you are going the Democrats one better.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Was there any testimony before your committee as to the financial responsibility of the Government of Pakistan?

Mr. COOLEY. Only the statement by the team of Dulles, Stassen, and Dr. Reed to the effect that they had to use so much of their money to support their currency that if they were required to pay for the wheat it might bring them to economic instability.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Was there any testimony before the gentleman's committee about the great private wealth in Pakistan, the wealth of individuals, the wealth of spiritual leaders, for example, the Agha Khan who is supported to a great extent by their poor people who are now in need?

Mr. COOLEY. No; no such testimony was offered before our committee. I think that is a matter which would more appropriately come for the consideration of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Our committee is not accustomed to dealing with matters affecting foreign affairs. This is definitely a foreign-aid program and we should have had an opportunity last week to know that we were going to be asked to give Pakistan an additional \$100 million to tide them over during this emergency. Last year they got only a \$15 million loan—and last week we gave them \$27 million.

Mr. DEVEREUX. The gentleman made a statement about charity. Is he in accord with the belief that charity begins at home?

Mr. COOLEY. I am, and I am fully aware of the situation described here by

the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] a moment ago. I have a similar situation in my own home county, where the people have had their crops completely destroyed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there is no provision in Federal law that grants be made to my constituents for the hardships they are now undergoing.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In the wheat for India bill of 1951, I believe it was, an amendment was inserted by the House that India make available to this country strategic materials.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know what happened under that amendment?

Mr. COOLEY. I am not sure, but my impression is that India did make some concessions and we did receive some strategic materials to be used in connection with our atomic-energy program.

Mr. GROSS. And, of course, we paid for them.

Mr. COOLEY. I presume so.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman is a member of the Agricultural Committee. Did anybody appearing before the committee indicate the manner in which this wheat is to be distributed, whether it is going to reach the poverty-stricken people?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] touched on that just before he closed his statement. The Government of Pakistan shall determine who is able to pay and who is not able to pay. Those who are not able to pay will receive the wheat free of charge; those able to pay will be required to pay under such rules and regulations as may be laid down by the President of the United States when he makes the agreement providing for delivery.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman keeps saying this is a matter that should be handled by the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. COOLEY. It should have been.

Mr. RICHARDS. All right. Does the gentleman remember only a year or two ago when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLISON] proposed that part of these materials to be furnished foreign countries come from the surplus commodities in this country and the gentleman himself opposed it because these commodities would have had to be charged to the Commodity Credit Corporation. The gentleman said then that the Agricultural Committee was the

only committee that could handle those surplus commodities.

Mr. COOLEY. And I will say that if you amend this bill and charge it up to agriculture and to the cause of agriculture now, I will vote against it and I think every member of the Agricultural Committee would do the same thing. It is not fair to saddle on the backs of the farmers this \$100 million.

Mr. RICHARDS. The Commodity Credit Corporation is provided for. There is a charge there.

Mr. COOLEY. No. The bill provides that it shall be bought from the Commodity Credit Corporation, paid for and charged to foreign aid.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Is there anything in the bill that would prohibit the cost of this transportation being paid out of the proceeds from the sale of the wheat over there that is going to be sold in Pakistan?

Mr. COOLEY. This bill only contemplates payment by our Government of freight charges to ship side at the ports where it will be shipped out. But it does not require the Pakistan Government that receives the benefit of the wheat to pay the ocean freight.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I think the gentleman missed the point. The bill provides that some of this wheat may be given to the real people in distress, the other part of it that it can be sold to the government of Pakistan. Is there anything in the bill that would prevent the government of Pakistan from paying the freight out of the proceeds received from the sale of the part of the wheat they are giving to the people over there that have the money to buy the wheat and who can afford to pay for it?

Mr. COOLEY. There is nothing in the bill that prevents Pakistan from paying the freight, but, certainly, there is nothing in the bill that requires Pakistan to pay the freight, and we brought this bill out here after having received testimony from Mr. Stassen to the effect that the Government would pay the freight out of MSA funds.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. If we adopt an amendment which requires them to pay the freight out of the sale of the wheat that they are selling to their own people that have the money, that can afford to pay for it, what is wrong with that?

Mr. COOLEY. That is going to be proposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Of course, the people of Pakistan pay for this wheat, out of the proceeds of the sale, with rupees.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Could they not get some of the ECA dollars?

Mr. HOPE. And I do not know of any shipowners that would take their pay in rupees.

Mr. COOLEY. This contemplates also counterpart funds, and the use of the rupees will be under the direction of our Government.

Mr. HOPE. And in Pakistan that is the accepted currency.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Is it not also true, following what the gentleman from Kansas has said, that the testimony showed that it was necessary to use these funds in order to rehabilitate the agriculture of Pakistan to keep this thing from happening again?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right, and the rupees will be used under our supervision from the counterpart funds.

Mr. ALBERT. They can use those rupees even if foreign shippers would not accept them.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The \$27 million that was authorized here a few days ago in the other bill will be used for the same purpose as the counterpart funds from the sale of the wheat over in that country.

Mr. COOLEY. Probably so, but it seems to me that this is an awfully large gift for Pakistan, even though she has difficulties and she is an ally. I cannot lead myself to believe that this is not going to establish some sort of an unfortunate precedent which is going to lead to our making similar gifts to other people throughout the world.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman recollects that I asked that question of the Secretary, and also Mr. Stassen, and they said it would not establish any precedent. I am not so sure about it, but I did want to get that as a matter of record.

Mr. COOLEY. Notwithstanding what they said, the fact remains that it will be a precedent.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Let us take a look at this Pakistan question. In World War II India had some 4,000,000 men under arms. Pakistan made quite a contribution to that. How many men does Pakistan have in Korea today?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not know, I am sure. I am sorry I cannot answer that question.

Mr. GROSS. You can just about count them on the fingers of your hand.

Mr. COOLEY. I have every reason to believe that Pakistan is a reliable and trustworthy ally and that the people of Pakistan do not want to be enslaved, they want to be free and will fight in defense of freedom. We are told that Pakistan has a formidable force of fighting men now guarding an important pass through which the force of aggression might some day start to march. The Nation is in a most unusual and unfortunate situation, divided into two

parts with a thousand miles of the territory of India in between. Kashmir is likewise in an unfortunate situation. If the people of Kashmir are to really be considered in this controversy, it seems to me that instead of insisting that they should join either India or Pakistan, the forces of democracy and free government and the sponsors of the right of men to be free should insist that the people of Kashmir might be given an opportunity to say not only whether they want to go with India or with Pakistan, but should also be given a definite right to say whether they want to remain as Kashmir, free and unattached from either India or Pakistan. Why can't these wise men on our missions speak out for the people of Kashmir and give us information which apparently we do not now have. If this question of Kashmir can be settled, perhaps the controversy between Pakistan and India would likewise come to an early end and the people of that area of the world could go about their business unafraid.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it abundantly plain that I expect to vote for this wheat to the Republic of Pakistan. I voted against the granting of 2 million tons of wheat to India. I thought that the precedent would be bad. When we voted for wheat for India I stated then that if it became necessary—if similar circumstances arose in Pakistan, I felt that Indian action would be a precedent. Now I feel that we must do for a friendly, neighboring nation, as much as we did for India. Consequently, conditions having arisen as they have in Pakistan, I expect to vote to give Pakistan 1 million tons of wheat. I think they need it. I think the Pakistanis are our friends. I think they are in a position to do us more good than anybody in that part of the world. I think the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, rather clearly explained the situation over there except that he did not point out that India and Pakistan have been at a point of undeclared war for about 4 or 5 years.

The Pakistanian people feel, and I am afraid with considerable justification, that our grant to India was in effect a subsidization of the Indian army. I do not think we ought to play favorites between nations. I do not think we ought to do for India more than we do for Pakistan. I know that the people of Pakistan are certainly as friendly as the people of any other nation in that part of the world. I am quite sure the people of Pakistan are as free from communism as any people in that section of the world. Therefore, let us treat Pakistan as we treated India.

That does not mean, however, that we should use a grant of wheat to hungry people as a vehicle on which to tie a gift to a group of American shipowners or a group of American seamen's unions. As a matter of fact, I believe that it tarnishes the gift that we propose to make to these people to use it as a means of covering up a grant, a direct subsidy,

a gift to American shipping interests. So it is my intention when the appropriate time arrives to offer an amendment which will make it perfectly clear that the United States will not pay any part of the transportation costs beyond American ports.

In other words, say I have a pretty good watermelon patch. When I go by my neighbor's house, I suggest he come on by and get himself a load of melons. I do not think it is an unneighborly act, because I have not told him that I am going to bring them to him, to chill them, and put them on his table. I do not think we have to mill this wheat, although the millers came before our committee and asked that we give them the job of doing it. I do not think we have to grind this into flour. I do not think we have to make this into cake. I do not think we have to put butter and honey on the bread, although both butter and honey are surplus commodities in the United States. I do not think we have to decorate the bread with tung nuts, or put a package of Camels with each biscuit we send these people. As a matter of fact, I think these people are hungry for some wheat. I think we ought to give them wheat. We ought to let them have what they need. We should not use their need as an excuse to make gifts of unknown sums to American shipping interests.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Just how are they going to pay for the transportation? The testimony is that they cannot pay it.

Mr. POAGE. The testimony was that they had the sterling balance with which to pay it, but it would be a burden upon their economy to do it. That was the undisputed testimony before our committee. There was not one single witness who would say they did not have the sterling with which to pay. They said it would burden them to pay for it. Of course it would, and it burdens the American people to pay this transportation. It burdens the American people several times more to pay for this, because if we pay for it it has to be shipped in American bottoms. All the members of our committee heard the testimony that the present going rate from here to Pakistan is approximately \$26 a ton for wheat in American ships. It is less than one-half that in foreign ships. We tried to pin down the shipping interests. Our former chairman asked them if they would not make some concession because this was a charitable proposition. They said "No," they could not make a concession. We asked them for assurance that they would take \$26 a ton. No, they could not give us that assurance.

As a matter of fact, the cost of ocean shipping is controlled by competition. There is no ICC of the ocean. It is perfectly plain that when we begin to move a great volume of freight of this kind to Pakistan the cost of ocean transportation is going up. It will not move for \$26 a ton. There is not a man or woman in this House today who knows how much it

will cost us to move that wheat by ocean shipping.

There is this further thing. Right now there are 165 tramp ships under American registry. The United States Government has 125 of those ships under charter. We know that if we begin to move this wheat in large quantities the cost of those 125 ships, the cost of transportation to Korea, of transportation to Japan, of transportation to Germany, is going to be more. Do not let anybody deceive you into thinking that you are only talking about how much you are going to put out on moving this wheat to Pakistan. If you vote for this proposition to have the United States Government still further subsidize ocean transportation, and provide that this wheat must move in American bottoms, you are going to raise the cost of all ocean transportation to your Government, and your Government today is employing several times as many ships regularly as is going to be necessary to move this wheat to Pakistan. If the American shipping interests are entitled to further subsidy, let them come in and openly tell us why and how much.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I merely wanted to add to what the gentleman said, when he said that the cost of transporting this wheat to Pakistan is roughly \$26 per ton, that that is in dollars and in American bottoms.

Mr. POAGE. That is right, in American bottoms.

Mr. JUDD. But if it is transported in other ships that will take sterling, it will be about \$12 or \$13 a ton; is that not correct?

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. JUDD. Does the gentleman know of one American shipowner who will take sterling?

Mr. POAGE. No; I do not.

Mr. JUDD. Does the gentleman know any American shipowner who will take sterling let alone rupees?

Mr. POAGE. No; I do not.

I do not propose to confine this to the American shipowners. I propose to let the Pakistanians transport it any way they want to, whether it be in Japanese bottoms or whether they do it with Indian ships. They do exchange with India. They do sell jute to India and they can get Indian rupees. They can get the same transportation that India got. They can pay for it either in rupees or in sterling. When they pay for it, it will be something in the neighborhood of \$12 million against an unknown astronomical figure if we have to pay for it, and carry the wheat in American bottoms.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Does the gentleman understand that the extra cost, if we pay for it at the normal rate for this shipping, would amount to a minimum of \$5 million to the American taxpayers?

Mr. POAGE. Five million dollars. No; I understand it would be a very mini-

mum, if rates stayed where they are today, of some \$13 million for one-half the wheat. You cannot get it any lower than that even if you are able to hold ocean-shipping rates where they are today, and if you do not affect any other shipping. But I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that you are going to affect the price of every ton that moves from here to Japan. You are going to affect the price of all ocean shipping in American bottoms when you require even a part of this wheat to be carried by American ships.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Further, this bill is an effort to help the people of Pakistan and not to help the American shipowners, is that not correct?

Mr. POAGE. Well, that depends on whose effort you are talking about. That is what some people have told you, and I do not blame you for understanding that. I wish I could believe that is all that is involved. I have listened to enough testimony from the shipowners to be thoroughly convinced that there are a lot of people who are more interested in what the American shipowners can get out of this than in what we can do for Pakistan.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. If we adopt the amendment, which the gentleman from Texas proposes to offer to the bill, we will come closer to doing something for the people of Pakistan than in providing a subsidy for the American shipowners, is that not correct?

Mr. POAGE. That is right. But if my amendment is adopted, as I hope it will be, I fear you will see a surprising loss of interest in this bill.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I am glad to have these recruits to this position because during the first 3 years that we had the foreign-aid bill, our former colleague the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. Kee, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], and I, for 3 years in succession combated the amendment to compel 50 percent of all our foreign aid to go in American bottoms. We thought that if we ought to have a subsidy for American shipping, we ought not to have it under the disguise of foreign aid. We were defeated every single year that the question came up until we had recruits like the gentleman from Texas who sided with us.

Mr. POAGE. If American shipping needs an additional subsidy, let us lay the cards on the table and tell the House how much of a subsidy it needs. Let us not give an unknown subsidy. Let us know how much it is. Maybe such a subsidy is justified, but let us at least decide that on its own merits. Let us not use our charity for hungry friends as an excuse to raise all ocean shipping rates.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the debate, particularly in the statements of my good friend, the gentleman from Texas. I want at this time also to assure him that I have confidence in his intentions. I think he is on the right track, but I also

want to say I expect to support this bill. There is a great deal of reluctance, I know, in the minds of most of you as to how appropriately this action we are taking is going to be received, and whether there is an end in sight so far as we are concerned, and just how our generosity will be interpreted throughout the world. I am not going to dwell upon the principles that are at stake because they have been pretty well set forth, I think, in the debate. I just want to talk briefly, in the limited time I have, about the question of shipping.

It seems to me that I inadvertently set off this firecracker myself in the committee when I drew the attention of the Mutual Security Director, Mr. Stassen, to the vagueness of the wording of the bill; that it was impossible to tell from the draft of the legislation who was expected to pay the shipping cost. We were very much interested, when we found from his testimony that the United States Government was expected to pay the shipping cost, in what it was going to cost. It was brought out during the course of the testimony that the cost would probably vary from \$13 to \$25 a ton, depending upon whether it was hauled in ships under the American flag or in those of other nations. That differential was due to the higher cost that our shipping experienced because of the higher wages that we pay to the men employed.

There is a great deal of justice, so far as the House is concerned, as I see it, in saying to the people of Pakistan, "We are going to pay for the wheat, and you folks can come and get it."

I am reminded of a little story that happened several years ago. This happened in my own town. One of my friends had the misfortune to suffer a fire loss. When the adjuster came to settle, they agreed upon the restoration of all of that part of the home that had been destroyed but he said in conclusion, "Now, we are not going to pay for the paint, because your house needed paint anyway." The fellow remonstrated, and said, "The paint is scorched, it looks bad, and it will have to be painted."

"Well," he said, "My insurance company will not pay for painting it."

The fellow scratched his head a minute, and he turned around to the adjuster and said, "Let me say this. When you get the bill for this restoration, you are not going to see the paint in the bill, but I can assure you, my friend, that the paint is going to be in the bill."

I am going to say to you Members of the House—and this is my own opinion—that regardless of what action you take here today, when it is finally finished the paint is going to be in our bill.

As I view it, it is a matter purely of policy. Actually, there are some physical factors involved. I doubt very much, due to the urgency with which this wheat must be delivered, that we can be adamant and say that it must all go in either non-American flag ships or in American flag ships. As Mr. COOLEY, I think it was, stated, there are about 100 ships going to be involved. But that would be in case they could take a full

load. None of these ships, probably, should take a full load, or could. So several hundred ships inevitably are going to be involved.

There is urgency in getting this wheat to Pakistan. I do not believe the House should take hasty action. I believe that we should have, when we resume this bill tomorrow, and I expect as one Member to attempt to have, more definite information as to the possibility concerning what we can provide or what will be provided by way of shipping facilities to get this wheat there.

That is the No. 1 objective, to get the wheat there. I think it ill becomes the House to argue too deeply the question who is going to haul the wheat, if in the meantime the people over there do not get the wheat. To me that is the paramount issue. Other things are secondary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOPE. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HARVEY. So I say before we jump over the deep end so far as this amendment is concerned, let us have all the facts and information that are available and make sure in drafting and amending this legislation that we are not going to set up some impossible provisions that will negate the entire usefulness of what we do, and it will also have the great probability of undoing the great good that this humanitarian motive has behind it. Again I say to you that I expect to support this bill and I feel that when the House has concluded its deliberations the majority of you will agree that it is a thing that we need to do and should do.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time, 4 minutes, to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, when I come to the well of the House it is usually to ask questions; I do not feel much of the time that I can tell you anything, but I do like to ask some questions sometimes.

It appears to me insofar as the pending measure is concerned that if there is any justification on this globe for our giving anybody anything it is to give wheat to Pakistan, one of the leaders of the Moslem world. We succeeded not too many years ago in completely antagonizing about 400 million Moslems. We did that largely because the Moslem's enemies have kinfolds who vote in the United States elections and we sided with their enemies. But regardless of reasons for our doing that we did succeed in antagonizing roughly 400 million Moslems. Now, if we have wheat, and the testimony shows that we do have, that is going to waste, I feel that rather than do as we did in the case of potatoes—we made them unusable—that we can be justified perhaps in making this wheat available here in the United States for them to come get. The testimony shows that if they do pay for the transportation that they must use money that is acceptable in the sterling area. Perhaps if we give them some wheat for the ships that use sterling to haul, that those ships then can haul some of our wheat

to Pakistan instead of hauling Red troops to Korea to kill our men.

There are a couple of questions I want to ask about this. One of the more serious questions has to do with policy. I was told originally, and there are some who still tell me, that the major consideration of this measure is a humanitarian one, that we are feeding starving people and that we are picking and choosing the starving people we feed in that we proposed to feed the starving who happen to be friendly to us. That was the assumption that I was proceeding upon until a witness speaking for the administration who had been head of the mission that was sent into Pakistan to examine into the need for this measure was establishing before the committee the humanitarian need for this legislation. I asked him if it was the administration policy to feed hungry people. He said, "Yes." I asked if it was the policy to feed hungry people, Communist or non-Communist. He said, "Yes." I said, "In or outside of Russia?" He said, "Yes.."

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HARVEY. I would just like to say in that respect that the gentleman to whom the gentleman now speaking referred was part of the commission that went over there, was head of the experimental staff at Purdue University and was not in any event charged with the determination of State Department policies.

Mr. WHEELER. Was I under a misapprehension? I was led to believe that he was speaking for the proponents of this amendment.

Mr. HARVEY. I just wish to correct the gentleman.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlemen yields, I think if the gentleman will check up the hearings he will find that that gentleman said:

I do not purport to speak for this policy of the State Department. As an individual I would.

I think you will find that is correct.

Mr. WHEELER. Perhaps that is true. I was given that information and until I check it my impression is that the policy now is to feed the hungry people regardless of their political ideology.

In conclusion, if we make this available, if it is a choice between making it available at American ports and letting the Pakistanians come and get it I will go along with that rather than dump it in the Hudson River.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GOLDEN].

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, when this bill was before our committee all the members on both sides of the aisle voted to report it out. In the debate so far there is an agreement in the minds of the Members of this body that some wheat should be given to Pakistan. There was no evidence in our committee opposing this bill. The sum total of the evidence can be found in the report where President Eisenhower states that the Pakistan nation is facing a famine and

that they have called upon the people of America to avert that disaster.

I am not disturbed about making this gift to a starving people. We should do it. That is the primary reason for voting this bill out today. However, I am tremendously disturbed about the cost in addition to the giving of the wheat. The bill properly provides for adequate measures to supervise the distribution of this wheat and to see to it that the needy people of Pakistan get it. Your committee has written into the bill a provision that any person in Pakistan who needs it and cannot pay for it will get it nevertheless and it also provides that there shall be adequate supervision on the part of the Pakistan Government by representatives of the United States to see that this wheat is properly distributed without any discrimination. The bill provides that the people of this country are to get credit for making this very magnanimous gift of practically \$100 million to a needy people and a friendly people. They are our friends and they have proven to be our friends. We need their friendship in this great worldwide struggle. But if we go along and permit the Administrator of Mutual Security to pay for all of the transportation of this wheat across the seas, then that is another proposition.

It is true we now have 310 million bushels of surplus wheat. On July 1 we will have 500 million bushels and a year from this July we will have 700 million bushels. We have a great abundance of wheat, but we do not have an abundance of cash. If we adopt this measure, and I hope we will—I intend to vote for it—we have got to pay the expenses of gathering this wheat from the storage bins in America and placing it in shipping facilities either on the Atlantic or the Pacific coast. That is going to cost some money. If we also permit the Mutual Security Administrator to pay for the transportation to Pakistan, the evidence before our committee shows that we will have let ourselves in for another from \$15 to \$25 million. I think it is all right to give these people that wheat. I think it is a good thing also to get rid of some of our surplus. But I am going to go along with some of the members of this committee that think that the cost of transportation ought to be borne by the Pakistanian Government and the people that are getting the benefit of this great gift of \$100 million worth of wheat.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I would just like to ask the gentleman if he did not sponsor an amendment in committee which lost by a 9-to-9 vote dealing with this very matter we are discussing.

Mr. GOLDEN. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to point that out so that the Members may know that that was in the minds of the members of the committee.

Mr. GOLDEN. I made that motion in committee and there were 9 for it and 9 against it. I think that if we give them the \$100 million of wheat, they will manage some way to carry it over there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to make available to the President out of wheat stocks acquired through price-support operations not to exceed 1 million long tons of wheat, during the period ending June 30, 1954, for transfer to the Government of Pakistan upon such terms and conditions as the President determines appropriate, of which 700,000 tons may be made available in order to alleviate starvation and mass suffering threatened by famine conditions in Pakistan and not to exceed 300,000 tons to provide such reserve supply as he may determine to be a necessary supplement to such emergency assistance. Commodity Credit Corporation shall deliver the wheat on board vessels in United States ports as directed by the President.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HALLECK, having assumed the chair, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5659) to provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan, had come to no resolution thereon.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during the debate last Thursday, in my remarks during the speech of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] the RECORD shows on page 7065, middle column, seventh line from the bottom, that I said "Government proposes to send 100 million long tons of wheat" which should read "1 million long tons of wheat." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1081) entitled "An act to provide authority for temporary economic controls, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate further disagrees to the amendment of the House to the above-entitled bill and asked a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and ordered, that Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. ROBERTSON be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

95), and also discussed its effect on farm exports with Sens. Sparkman, Mansfield, and Douglas (pp. 7273-77).

6. NOMINATION of Arthur S. Flemming as Director of Office of Defense Mobilization was confirmed (p. 7299).
7. EXPENDITURES. Sen. Byrd inserted a report by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, "Control of Collection and Use of Foreign Currencies by Federal Agencies," urging that normal budgetary, appropriation, and accounting controls be applied to foreign currencies collected by all Government agencies (pp. 7258-60).
8. RECREATION. Both Houses received a report by the Interior Department on the soil survey and land classification made of lands to be served by the Kennebec Division, Yakima Project, Wash. (pp. 7258, 7339-40).

HOUSE

9. FOREIGN AID. Passed, 310-75, with amendments H.R. 5659, providing for transfer of 1 million tons of price-support wheat to Pakistan (pp. 7302-33).

In addition to the committee amendments (p. 7326), an amendment by Rep. Weichel was agreed to, requiring transportation of at least half of the wheat in American-flag ships (pp. 7311-6).

Rejected the following amendments:

By Rep. Poage, to require Pakistan to pay the cost of ocean transportation of the wheat (pp. 7303-11).

By Rep. Bailey, 58-91, to require CCC to make available 1 ton of wheat, for every 100 tons sent to Pakistan, for distribution to needy areas in this country under the same conditions (pp. 7316-7).

By Rep. Bonner, 52-108, to require that wheat given to needy persons in Pakistan be labeled in containers as a free gift from the USA and distributed by a U.S. approved agency (pp. 7318-23).

By Rep. Fulton, 31-91, to require payment for the 300,000 reserve tons of wheat in strategic minerals and metals (pp. 7323-5).

By Rep. Jones (Mo.), 38-75, to use "wheat" throughout the bill in lieu of "commodities" and "supplies" (pp. 7325-6).

By Rep. Dorn (S. Car.), 51-91, to request supervision of Red Cross of distribution of the wheat in Pakistan (pp. 7326-7).

By Rep. Smith (Wis.), 65-110, to prevent sale by the Pakistan Government of any wheat furnished by this bill (pp. 7327-30).

By Rep. Jensen, to substitute 100,000 tons of corn meal for 100,000 tons of wheat (p. 7330).

By Rep. Curtis (Mo.), 52-123, to require congressional approval of programs and projects financed by counterpart funds derived from sale of wheat by Pakistan (p. 7331).

S. 2112, the Senate companion bill, was then amended to contain the text of H.R. 5659, and passed, after which the House bill was tabled (pp. 7332-3).

Received the State Department's report on the administration of the Yugoslav emergency relief assistance program from Dec. 16, 1952, through Mar. 15, 1953, (p. 7339).

Received Independent Calabrese Club (Paterson, N.J.) resolutions urging USDA to release surplus foods to starving people of the world (p. 7341).

Received a Federation of American Citizens of German Descent of Greater New York resolution "in behalf of the allotment, under the foreign aid program, of surplus food for free distribution among suffering people" (p. 7341).

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued
For actions of

June 24, 1953
June 23, 1953
83rd-1st, No. 114

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....	2,21	Food shortage.....	26	Prices, livestock.....	24
Corn.....	9	Foreign aid.....	9	Reclamation.....	8
Cotton.....	14	Lands, grazing.....	22	Rubber.....	12
Disaster relief.....	16	public.....	3	Soil conservation.....	22
Drought.....	11	transfer.....	17	Surplus food.....	9
Economic controls.....	10	Leave.....	1	T.V.A.....	13
Electrification.....	25	Minerals.....	9	Trade, foreign.....	4,5,18
Expenditures.....	7,23	Nomination.....	6	Trade agreements.....	18
Farm policy.....	19	Personnel.....	1,15,23	Transportation.....	6
Flood control.....	27	Prices, support.....	20,23	Wheat.....	4,9

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed wheat-for-Pakistan bill. House agreed to further conference on economic controls bill. Senate committee reported Army civil appropriation bill. Senate agreed to conference report on leave bill. Sen. Anderson introduced and discussed bill establishing 3-year cotton-quota base.

SENATE

1. PERSONNEL; LEAVE. Agreed to the conference report on H.R. 4654, to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951. Sen. Carlson inserted his statement explaining the effect of this bill as agreed upon by the conferees. (p. 7266)
Sen. Johnston spoke on the need for leave benefits and severance protection for Federal employees, urging the adoption of a "positive and forthright program," and inserted a statement of the Government Employees' Council of AF of L, "Federal Workers Need Unemployment Insurance Now" (pp. 7295-96).
2. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H.R. 5376, the Army civil functions appropriation bill for 1954 (S. Rept 456) (p. 7258). The "Daily Digest" states: "As approved, the bill would provide a total of \$473,762,900, an increase of \$57,371,300 over the House-passed figure of \$416,391,600" (p. D596).
3. SUBMERGED LANDS. Debated S. 1901, providing for U. S. jurisdiction over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf (pp. 7296-98).
4. WHEAT; FOREIGN TRADE. The "Daily Digest" states that the Foreign Relations Committee announced subcommittee hearings for June 26, on Executive H. 83rd Congress (International Wheat Agreement) (p. D596).
5. RECIPROCAL TRADE. Sen. Humphrey said there is a need for a "broader, more lenient, more stable U.S. trade policy" and discussed the place of reciprocal trade in the economic and security pattern of the U.S. and its allies (pp. 7271-

Washington, as our National Capital, is the showplace of the Nation and what we do here is interpreted throughout the world as indicative of our national attitude and policy. The lying Communist propaganda has for a long time been seeking to use to its advantage with the colored peoples of the world statutes which I seek to repeal relating to segregation in the District of Columbia. This lying propaganda has been used in Korea and areas of south and southeast Asia in which the Soviet and its satellites are the aggressors. As an essential measure in the defense of the free world and to validate our own Constitution, Congress should do its best in eliminating segregation in the District of Columbia.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct the RECORD. On page 7222 of the RECORD of yesterday, in the first column, second paragraph from the bottom of the page, it should be corrected and changed from "The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds," to read "The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] who is chairman of the subcommittee."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works may sit any time today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on today and tomorrow, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

NATIONAL MILITARY UNITS FROM COMMUNIST COUNTRIES AND THE LIBERATION POLICY

(Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think current events show that President Eisenhower when he spoke before the American Legion last summer in August and advocated a policy of liberation, and when Secretary Dulles wrote an article in Life magazine last May entitled "A Bold New Foreign Policy" calling for a policy of liberation, were right at that time and such a policy is demanded now. If there have been influences brought to bear on our Government to curb this policy of liberation, those influences should not be heeded at this time. Now, more than ever, our policy should be to support the movements of resistance behind the Iron Curtain. Such a policy is the only one that will bring us peace eventually. A provision of the mutual security law which is now on our books provides for the setting up of national military units composed of escapees from behind the Iron Curtain. It should be implemented now because such national military units will bear directly upon the Communist armed forces and will unloose the forces of defection and escape to freedom from the Communist armed forces.

These military units should have their own distinctive uniforms or markings and should carry their own national flags of freedom.

Once they are set up they will tend to paralyze the Soviet military potential because sizable elements of the Communist armed forces are as desirous of fighting for freedom rather than tyranny just as the workers would rather work for freedom than for tyranny.

FIVE BILLION OVERSEAS—HOW ABOUT A DROP IN THE BUCKET AT HOME?

(Mr. KRUEGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point and insert telegrams from the Governor of North Dakota and other sources therewith.)

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, after our great concern over the plight of our friends abroad, 1 million tons of wheat to Pakistan, and our generosity with nearly \$5 billion of the taxpayers' money, could not we give a little consideration to some of our food producers' needs right here at home?

At least 20,000 acres of grain and sugar beets were lost last week in the fertile Valley of the Red River of the North. Torrential rains have put the tributaries over the banks. Completely lost for the crop year, the damage to these lands will be at least \$5 million. These folks are not asking for relief or rehabilitation. They are asking for assistance in improving the channels of the Rush and Maple Rivers in this flat, level territory to speed up the runoff to prevent recurrence of these floods.

The North Dakota Legislature paved the way for local cooperation and maintenance.

Here is the word that comes to me from the folks back home, and I quote telegrams from the Governor of our State and the Maple-Sheyenne River Flood Control Association:

JUNE 22, 1953.

OTTO KRUEGER,
House Office Building;

Flood damage to crops in the Rush River, Swan Creek, and Maple River watersheds will reveal several million dollars additional appropriations for these projects now will help prevent recurrence in later years. Work to eliminate future damage can only be done in fall of the year.

NORMAN BRUNSDALE,
Governor of North Dakota.

FARGO, N. DAK., June 19, 1953.

OTTO KRUEGER,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE 83D CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO DISCONTINUE, CURTAIL, AND OTHERWISE HOLD IN ABEYANCE ANY AND ALL ACTION IN CONNECTION WITH THE PROPOSED SWAN CREEK PROJECT LOCATED IN THE COUNTY OF CASS AND STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA AND IN LIEU THEREOF TAKE THE NECESSARY AND PROPER STEPS IN ORDER TO MAKE IMPROVEMENTS ON THOSE RIVERS UPON WHICH SAID SWAN CREEK IS A TRIBUTARY

"Whereas the recent heavy rains coupled with the drainage of the water thereof from the fields throughout the entire central area of Cass County extending to a point 30 miles west of the Red River of the North have completely overflowed the banks of the riverbeds in which it is supposed to flow thereby causing great and terrible damage to the farms, livestock, and grain throughout the entire area in which damage is estimated to be at least \$5 million to the farmers of this section;

"Whereas said condition could be greatly alleviated if, instead of carrying out at the present time the proposed Swan Creek project, a thorough and complete drainage could be made of the rivers upon which said Swan Creek is a tributary thereby according the flowage from said Swan Creek, as well as the flowage from the rivers thereafter, a free and clear access to the Red River of the North;

"Whereas there is presently pending before the Senate of said 83d Congress of the United States provisions containing the Red River Valley of the North Authority, which, if properly amended and added to could relieve the present hardship on the farmers of the Northwest, namely, amend said provisions to include the following: channel and improvement work on the Maple River commencing at the mouth of Swan Creek on said Maple River, thence to the mouth of said Maple River on the Sheyenne River, thence on said Sheyenne River to the mouth of the Rush River, otherwise known as the Rush River flood-control district, thence continue on said Sheyenne River to its mouth on the Red River of the North; thence northward on said Red River of the North as provided for in said authority: Be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be properly authenticated by the board of directors of said association, and sent to United States Senator WILLIAM LANGER, United States Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, Congressman USHER L. BURDICK, and Congressman OTTO KRUEGER, the Vice President of the United States, as Presiding Officer of the Senate, and to each Member of the Senate of the United States."

The foregoing resolution was adopted by the newly organized Maple-Sheyenne River Flood Control Association at a meeting Thursday evening, June 18, 1953, in the community hall, Mapleton, N. Dak., at which meeting over 160 local farmers and residents were present.

Eighty-two families present estimated their personal damage at over \$850,000; the board of directors of said association estimated damage in the Maple River watershed to be conservatively at \$5 million; list of individuals damaged as well as aerial and ground

photos of disaster follow by mail; general consensus of opinion is it is utterly foolish to speed the flow of the headwaters (Swan Creek) and fail to clear the choked sections downstream.

MARK ANDREWS, *President.*

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JACKSON asked and was given permission to address the House on Thursday, July 23, for 90 minutes, following the legislative program of the day, and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

CORRECTION OF ROLLCALL

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected on rollcall 56, June 18, to show that I was present and voted for final passage.

EFFECT OF HARD MONEY POLICIES

(Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I made a statement on the floor that the so-called hard money policies could very easily lead to a major depression in this country; and I received from the left side of the aisle some rather tolerant smiles.

I would just like to report that the Wall Street Journal of today says that truck production in this country has been cut back 40 percent.

ANNULLING RATES UNDER TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

(Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to advise my colleagues of the House that on Friday last I introduced a joint resolution providing for annulling the rates under the Supplemental Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act with Venezuela in 1952, because the President exceeded his authority in applying his delegated authority to reduce or increase rates.

I want to say to my colleagues that I have asked for and secured a special order for tomorrow, after the close of the regular business, when I shall put all of the details in support of this resolution and all of the facts pertaining thereto in the RECORD for the information of the individual Members of the House.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was granted permission to address the House on today and tomorrow for 15 minutes, and to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous material following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

CREEPING INCREASES

(Mr. FRIEDEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Esso Standard Oil Co. announced for the second time in 10 days a price boost of gas and fuel oil. This increase was followed today by other major oil companies.

Several weeks ago the price of steel went up. The effect of that increase will not be felt by the consumer for several months to come, but the gas increase takes additional money out of his pocket starting right now. He uses his automobile daily, not as a luxury, but as an absolute necessity in everyday life.

When the Congress decided to abandon controls, we were told by big business that competition would take care of any trend toward inflation. The advice is working in reverse.

In just 10 days the cost of gasoline and fuel oil has been raised twice. I would hate to think that this is a precedent of what we can expect when rent controls are terminated next month.

The Treasury Department officials have voiced concern several times about inflation. Here is an example of why not only the Treasury, but the Congress, as well, should be alarmed.

Mr. Speaker, I call this to the attention of my colleagues, and ask, where will the prices be by Christmas should these creeping increases be allowed to continue?

TEMPORARY ECONOMIC CONTROLS

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 1031, an act to provide authority for temporary economic controls, and for other purposes, with a House amendment thereto, further insist on the House amendment and agree to a further conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. PATMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I make this reservation to state that I have given notice that I expected to offer a motion to instruct conferees, but after examining and evaluating the situation and talking to different members of the committee, including the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott], I shall not do that.

I hope the bill goes to conference and that we shall work out the very best agreement we can work out.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GAMBLE, Mr. TALLE, Mr. KILBURN, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, and Mr. PATMAN.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred fifty-four Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 62]

Adair	Hart	Philbin
Becker	Harvey	Phillips
Blatnik	Herlong	Powell
Bolling	Hoffman, Ill.	Prouty
Busbey	Kearney	Regan
Bush	Kelly, N. Y.	Riehlman
Chatham	Lesinski	Roosevelt
Chudoff	Lucas	St. George
Dies	McVey	Sheppard
Dooliver	Mack, Ill.	Taylor
Donovan	Meador	Thornberry
Fogarty	Miller, Calif.	Velde
Frelinghuysen,	Morrison	Vursell
Jr.	Nelson	Wigglesworth
Gamble	O'Hara, Minn.	Wilson, Calif.
Green	O'Konski	Yates
Hale	Ostertag	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 377 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

WHEAT FOR PAKISTAN

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5659) to provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5659, with Mr. ELLSWORTH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read the first section of the bill.

Are there any amendments to the first section?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, when is it in order to offer an amendment to the title of the bill? I have such an amendment to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. Titles to bills are amended after the bill is considered in the House for passage.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the first section of the bill. The amendment was filed

with the Clerk yesterday and I should like recognition to offer the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be recognized at the appropriate time. Under the rules of the House, members of the committee are recognized first to offer amendments.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the first section of the bill, at the top of page 2, the end of the paragraph. Will I be recognized on that amendment after the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be recognized at the appropriate time.

The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE: On page 2, line 6, after the period insert "The United States assumes no further obligation in regard to the wheat and no agency of the United States shall have authority to pay any ocean transportation or other further costs with respect to the wheat."

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I have tried to analyze the two different viewpoints that are involved in this bill. I believe it is fair to say that one of the viewpoints is the good-neighbor viewpoint. That is the viewpoint I am trying to express this morning. If we have a patch of watermelons and our neighbor has none, he is invited to come get some with no charge—purely a good-neighbor act. We tell him to come in and help himself. I think that is a good-neighbor policy; I think it is a sound policy.

On the other hand, we are confronted with what I have chosen to call the Santa Claus policy; and, indeed, it is a Santa Claus policy going much further than we have gone before. We not only say that we are going to make you a gift but because Santa Claus drives his reindeer around the world we are going to deliver it to you, just as if Uncle Sam could ship this wheat by reindeer. But Uncle Sam does not have any reindeer and there is no way we can deliver that wheat to them except through high-priced American-flag shipping.

I would call your attention further to the fact that we cannot make this delivery by reindeer. We cannot follow this Santa Claus policy and simply say that we give you this wheat. In addition, we are going to have to pay not thirteen to twenty-five million dollars for shipping this wheat; we have got to go way above that. If you are willing to play Santa Claus, you must then be prepared to be willing to raise the cost of all the ocean shipping for which the United States pays. I presented these figures yesterday. They are from the Military Sea Transport Service of the United States and they are dated June 22, 1953.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. There is some controversy as to the accuracy of the figures

the gentleman has used. Will the gentleman please indicate from the communication that he has before him the date and the source so that we can be certain of the figures?

Mr. POAGE. Yes; that is exactly what I am going to do. I am reading from this letter dated June 22, 1953, signed by Vice Adm. F. C. Denebrink. He says that at the present time there are approximately 165 vessels in the United States-flag fleet, of which 125 are under charter to the Military Sea Transport Service.

The current daily rate now being paid is \$1,700. He then goes on and says:

In my opinion, if the Mutual Security Agency undertook to move the bulk of the Pakistan wheat within a period of 2 or 3 months and was required to use American bottoms for at least half of it, it would have an effect of raising the charter rates offered to the Military Sea Transport Service.

I am reading you what the Military Sea Transport Service of the United States says. They are employing the great bulk of our transport vessels. They are engaged in hauling war materials to Korea; they are engaged in getting military equipment to Japan, to Germany, and to other distant points of the world. The United States Government is today paying \$1,700 per day per ship.

This letter does not say it, but the Military Sea Transport Service anticipates that if a substantial portion of this wheat is to be moved by United States ships, they would probably have to pay \$2,400 a day.

You just figure it up; \$2,400 a day on 125 ships and you do not know for how long. You are not talking about a small amount; you are not talking about a fractional amount of the cost of the wheat; you are talking about figures that run far greater than the total cost of the wheat. The total cost of the wheat is about \$84 million. You are talking about something that may well run over a hundred million dollars. You are setting a policy; not only are you fixing the price to transport this wheat, but you are also fixing the additional transportation costs of all the goods that the United States Government has to transport, and our Government is the greatest shipper of goods in all this world.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman discuss the comparative freight rates between foreign ships and our own merchant ships?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(On request of Mr. COOLEY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. POAGE was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. POAGE. I think it is fair to say that representatives of the shipping interests came before our committee to see how much business they could get out of this committee, how much grant they could get rather than how much help Pakistan could get. They told us that the present going rate was \$26 a ton from

here to Pakistan for wheat. They told us that foreign ships were operating for approximately one-half of that amount and figures varying from \$10 to \$13 per ton were quoted for foreign shipping. In other words, the Pakistanian Government could move all of this wheat for less money than the United States would have to put out to move half of it.

Is it good business for the United States to come along and say: We are going to ship half of this wheat in American bottoms and pay more money for shipping that half than Pakistan would have to pay to ship the entire amount of wheat? Is it good business for the United States to say that because we want to give to the shipping companies of America an additional bonus, an additional subsidy, over and above what we have given them throughout the years, we are now going to hand them an unknown sum of money? I say to you, Mr. Chairman, if the shipping interests of this country are in such condition and they are entitled to a subsidy, let the proper committee, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, bring in a bill which will tell us just how much they are entitled to have. Let them come before us and tell us why our shipping interests are entitled to a subsidy. Let them tell us how much that subsidy should be or will be. Do not leave an open end beyond which we will not know how far we are going.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that when the milling industry was before our committee the representative of that industry was asked a question if they would be willing to grind this wheat into flour and to make some concession and if he did not reply that the milling industry would be glad to do it at actual cost?

Mr. POAGE. Yes; they did.

Mr. COOLEY. We asked the shipping industry if they would make any concessions and the representative of that industry said he was in no position to discuss the matter.

Mr. POAGE. That is right. Both of the industries came before our committee to see what they could get out of it. The milling industry said: We will make concessions. We want to keep our people at work, we want to keep our mills running, we do not want to shut down and we will do it at cost. When the former chairman asked the representative of the shipping interests if he would do likewise, he said: "No, I cannot promise you that. I cannot promise you we will not raise the rates." In fact, we know they will raise the rates, because he testified that ocean shipping rates are fixed by competition on the basis of the law of supply and demand, that if there are more goods to be shipped the rates are going up. Consequently, if we are going to provide some 50 ships to move this wheat, of course the rates are going up, not only for wheat but all the rates on all ocean shipping in which the United States is involved are going up.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the most serious thing about this. If you do not remember anything else I have said this morning, remember we are not simply talking about the shipping rates on this

wheat. When you talk about guaranteeing a portion of this shipment to American bottoms we are talking about a proposition that involves all ocean rates that the United States Government has to pay and the United States is the biggest shipper in the world, using something like four-fifths of all the American tramp ships today.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYLE. Did the gentleman's committee take into consideration the \$4,800,000,000 authorization which we handled last week when you considered this additional \$100 million bill?

Mr. POAGE. Our committee was not advised at that time. I cannot say we did take it into consideration. Of course, we knew there was going to be a foreign-aid bill.

Mr. LYLE. I cannot help but observe that under the Fair Deal we sold wheat to India and took notes, however worthless they may be, and they paid the freight on the wheat. Under the No Deal we give it to them, then pay the freight on it. I am wondering if it would not be better to have a Little Deal here.

Mr. POAGE. Yes. This is a proposition not only to give the wheat away, but to deliver it and hang it on a Christmas tree. Maybe we should have put some red bells on it, too. Again the present administration has proven that it can do all the New Deal did and when it comes to giving something away that it can give it away more freely.

I just wonder why we can not for once consider the effect of our action on the welfare of the American taxpayer.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a matter in which we ought to try to find a reasonable solution, and it is also a matter to which a great deal of thought and study has been given by the executive departments which will handle it.

I have before me a letter from the Director of Mutual Security, Mr. Harold E. Stassen, on this subject, and also on the question of carriage in American ships. Of course, if we adopt the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas, we might just as well not pass the bill because Pakistan does not have the shipping, nor does it have the dollars or the pounds that would enable it to pay the freight on all these shipments. It is thought Pakistan may be able to pay a part of the ocean freight in sterling, and it is the intention of the Mutual Security Administration to ask that Pakistan pay what it can pay on the shipping charges.

I want to insert in the RECORD, after the Committee goes into the House, the entire letter from Mr. Stassen, but I want to at this time read some excerpts from it:

In the present case Pakistan has almost no holdings of sterling, dollars, or gold other than a relatively small amount needed to back its currency. It would be an extreme hardship for Pakistan to attempt to pay any dollar shipping costs and undesirable from the point of view of our interest in Pakistan's stability to require it to do so.

It has been the general practice of the Congress to require that, insofar as practicable, at least 50 percent of the tonnage of commodities made available with United States assistance be shipped in American flag vessels to the extent such vessels are available at market rates for United States flag vessels.

In view of all the circumstances, it is the intention of the executive branch to ask Pakistan to pay the portion of the shipping costs in sterling which Pakistan is able to pay and that the United States will pay the portion of the shipping costs which are in dollars. Unexpended funds already appropriated under the Mutual Security legislation for fiscal year 1953 will be used for this purpose. No new appropriations will be necessary. It is my belief that Pakistan may draw on its meager sterling reserves to pay for ocean transportation for approximately one-half of the wheat to be shipped and that the remainder will be dollar costs paid for by the Director of Mutual Security.

Thus if we adopt no amendments to this bill on either of these two subjects, that is the way the matter will be handled according to the Director of Mutual Security. It seems to me that this is a sound way to handle it. It is in accordance with the policies that Congress has laid down in the past. It is in accordance with Pakistan's ability to pay. Certainly we would be doing a reckless and a foolish thing if we should pass legislation now that Pakistan could not take advantage of or, if it did by some possible chance take advantage of, would leave it in a weakened financial condition, so that a year from now we might be called upon to give a greater measure of relief than it is necessary for us to give at this time. This amendment should be voted down.

The full text of the letter from Mr. Stassen is as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR FOR
MUTUAL SECURITY,
Washington D. C., June 19, 1953.
Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOPE: I understand that following my testimony before your committee on the Pakistan wheat bill, some discussion has arisen concerning the arrangements to be made for the transportation of the wheat and how the transportation is to be paid for. I should like to explain the position of the executive branch on these matters.

As you know, substantially all foreign-aid legislation has specifically or implicitly authorized the United States to pay for the costs of delivery of foreign-aid goods as part of the assistance granted. In the case of our relief assistance to Europe after the war, in our later relief and rehabilitation assistance to Europe, the Near East, and the Far East, in our military assistance program, and in such special legislation as relief to Yugoslavia, the United States has recognized that the financial position of the countries we have helped has made it necessary for us not only to make the goods available but to pay all or a portion of the costs of transportation to the ports of the receiving country. The one major exception to this practice has been the wheat loan to India. In that case, India had funds available to cover transportation and had stated its intention to do so.

In the present case Pakistan has almost no holdings of sterling, dollars, or gold other than a relatively small amount needed to back its currency. It would be an extreme

hardship for Pakistan to attempt to pay any dollar shipping costs and undesirable from the point of view of our interest in Pakistan's stability to require it to do so.

It has been the general practice of the Congress to require that, insofar as practicable, at least 50 percent of the tonnage of commodities made available with United States assistance be shipped in American-flag vessels to the extent such vessels are available at market rates for United States-flag vessels.

In view of all the circumstances, it is the intention of the executive branch to ask Pakistan to pay the portion of the shipping costs in sterling which Pakistan is able to pay, and that the United States will pay the portion of the shipping costs which are in dollars. Unexpended funds already appropriated under the mutual-security legislation for fiscal year 1953 will be used for this purpose. No new appropriation will be necessary. It is my belief that Pakistan may draw on its meager sterling reserves to pay for ocean transportation for approximately one-half of the wheat to be shipped, and that the remainder will be dollar costs paid for by the Director for Mutual Security.

In view of the discussion which has arisen concerning a requirement that Pakistan pay all shipping costs, I should like to repeat that, although Pakistan's financial condition would permit the payment in sterling of transportation of approximately half of the wheat, it would be effectively impossible for Pakistan to pay the dollar costs for the transportation of the other half. To compel Pakistan to find sterling vessels for all transportation would not only be a great strain upon Pakistan's sterling resources, but would, of course, deprive United States vessels of any share in the ocean transportation of the wheat.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD E. STASSEN,
Director for Mutual Security.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am in opposition to this amendment.

I listened on yesterday and again today to the argument made here by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]. I am convinced that he has not followed this overall program, otherwise he would not make the statements he has made. Actually, when the Congress first adopted the ECA program some years ago we wrote into the law a provision which has been continued in the law since that time, that 50 percent of these cargoes should be moved in American bottoms. Under that provision millions and millions and millions of tons of freight, various types of cargo, have been moved all over the world. In the authorization adopted here last week for the Mutual Security Administration, calling for four and a half or five billion dollars, that provision was again adopted.

Now we are confronted with the gentleman from Texas offering an amendment and giving us as a basis for it that if we adopt the same policy on a bill which involves \$100 million, not \$5 billion, oceangoing freight rates will be increased on all shipments by the American Government.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. No; I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman is talking about me.

Mr. BOGGS. I have not said anything unkind about the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman did not state correctly what I said. The gentleman is wrong.

Mr. BOGGS. That is the way I understood the gentleman. Maybe my ears are failing me, but my interpretation of what the gentleman said was that unless we adopt his amendment, and if we use some American bottoms to transport this grain, we will up the cost of ocean shipping for every ton of American freight moved under other programs.

If you have a \$5 billion program and you come along with a \$100 million program, it is ridiculous to assume that the \$100 million program is going to have any noticeable effect when you have a major program involving almost \$5 billion.

What was the original reason for adopting this amendment in the first place? The American merchant marine is an integral part of the Defense Establishment of the United States of America. Anybody who has studied the history of the American merchant marine realizes that time and time again we have had statements similar to the one made by the gentleman from Texas about subsidies, misinformation given to the Members of this body so that as the result invariably between national emergencies we have abandoned our American fleet, and come a new emergency we have been called upon to spend billions and billions and billions of dollars to rebuild and rehabilitate that fleet.

If the alternative meant substantial savings in funds, maybe there might be some justification for the type of amendment the gentleman from Texas offers, but let us look at it.

In response to a question from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] said that Pakistan could pay for this out of the \$90 million we voted them last week in the Mutual Security Administration program bill. In other words, we are supposed to take the Mutual Security Administration funds that we authorized last week and turn around and use those funds to subsidize foreign competition against the American merchant fleet.

As the gentleman from Kansas so ably pointed out a moment ago, Pakistan has no ships. It has no merchant fleet. Therefore, the effect of the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas would mean we would use MSA funds to subsidize other lines competing with American lines.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. It seems to me we have a meritorious case here. Charity calls for this action. It is directed

toward a great people who are friendly to us. That is an additional circumstance. So far as I am concerned, I have never placed any restrictions upon charities, and I do not think it is wise for us to place any restrictions on this occasion by compelling the Government of Pakistan to pay the transportation. I thoroughly agree with the position taken by my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I wish to make two brief comments. One is that there was \$27,500,000 for Pakistan in the bill last week and not \$71 million, or \$90 million or other figures that have been given.

The second is that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas would make it impossible to use those funds for ocean freight even if they were allocated for that purpose because his amendment says no funds from this or any other appropriation can be used to pay ocean freight. So the argument that Pakistan is getting money from us in other appropriations like MSA that it can use for this purpose falls of its own weight.

Mr. BOGGS. It seems to me that the observation of the gentleman from Minnesota is not necessarily correct. If you make available in credits to the government \$27 million or whatever the figure is, you necessarily free certain other funds for that purpose. If you do not make \$27 million available, then they would have to use their own funds. In other words, you may not be able to use the \$27 million to pay the cost of that ocean freight but by using the \$27 million for some other purposes, let us say irrigation or public works, then you have other funds available that you do use to pay the freight made possible by the \$27 million.

Mr. JUDD. But the fact is that Pakistan has only about \$4 million worth of gold, American currency, and about \$150 million in sterling. She has to have more than that to back her own currency with a 30-percent reserve. Her rupees will not pay for any shipping, and as the gentleman said, she has no ships of her own so no matter how much she gets in other appropriations, she will still be unable to mobilize enough foreign currency to buy transportation from the ships of the world.

Mr. BOGGS. I trust the gentleman from Minnesota is opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JUDD. I certainly am.

Mr. BOGGS. That is splendid.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend the gentleman on his typically intelligent approach to this problem. I should like to ask him if he does not agree with me that this is, in fact, no Santa Claus program nor even is it charity, but is another step in the program we have laid down for our own best interest.

Mr. BOGGS. I certainly think so.

Mr. KEOGH. Is it not a fact that it is generally agreed the forces of communism thrive mostly when people are hungry?

Mr. BOGGS. I think that has been demonstrated time and time again.

Mr. Chairman, I think the House should thoroughly understand what is involved here. It is very easy to talk about subsidies. It is very easy to get up and condemn a great American industry. It is very easy to shed something other than light on a matter which has been discussed in this body time and time again. The American merchant marine is private enterprise. It is one of the few merchant marines in the world that is in that condition. Talk about subsidy—why practically every other fleet that sails the ocean is owned and operated by their government.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. In speaking of subsidies, is it not true that the American tramp ship fleet is not subsidized by the Government?

Mr. BOGGS. As a matter of fact, I just do not believe there is a word which has been more carelessly used over a period of time than the word "subsidy" as applied to the American shipping industry. I am quite sure the members of this great Committee on Agriculture do not know as much about this subject as other Members who have studied this problem. I would rather follow the advice of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON], men who have studied this problem year in and year out than any of my friends, the distinguished members of the Committee on Agriculture. I admire them and respect them; but I say, with all due respect to them, that they have not studied this problem of the American merchant marine, and it is ridiculous to get up here and talk about subsidies.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] does not want to have remain in the RECORD some of the statements he made on yesterday and today. I went to the Committee on Agriculture of the House and got a copy of the transcript of the hearings on this bill and find that only one person, so far as I could learn from the record, who knew anything about the American Merchant Marine, testified. That was Mr. Fraser Bailey, who is executive secretary of the subsidized flag lines.

On page 184 of the hearings, Mr. POAGE asked Mr. Bailey, "What would be the transportation cost?"

Mr. Bailey replied, "\$15 to \$25 per ton."

It must be remembered that this is a bulk-cargo transaction. This is not a cargo that will go on primarily berth liners or regular ships that sail on regular schedule.

Again, in Mr. POAGE's statement on page 7248 of the RECORD, he said:

If you vote for this proposition to have the United States Government still further subsidize ocean transportation and provide that this wheat must move in American bottoms, you are going to raise the cost of all ocean transportation.

On the face of it, that statement is simply ridiculous. These American flag vessels that are not on regular schedule, which are subsidized, carry the bulk of our American commerce around the world. They are in a conference with all foreign operators, operators of flag vessels of foreign nations. They have conference rates and schedules. So the matter of hauling this freight on tramp vessels will not affect the flag-run vessels and will not affect the freight that we are now hauling to Korea or to Japan. At the time when we were shipping coal and other things and the tramp rate became high, the MSTs broke out of the reserve fleet a great number of our Liberty- and Victory-type vessels and put them under charter so as to hold freight rates down.

Mr. Chairman, due to the limited and infrequent movement of United States freight to Pakistan, American flag service is provided by only two or possibly three companies. These companies will only handle parcels of this cargo. This inevitably results generally in higher level freight rates than obtain to other areas of the world where there is less flag service to an area.

Pakistan normally is not a grain importing nation and seldom, if ever, uses berth rate via conference freight lines. American foreign flag service is \$24 per ton on flag runs. By comparison, the berth rate to German ports by conference lines is \$6 to \$7; \$8 to \$9 to Italy; and Greece, \$12 to \$13.

The American flag tramp rates are calculated as of today—this is the report I got today from the association that deals with making rates in tramp shipping—at \$18.50 a ton; and the foreign flag tramp operator rate is \$10.50 a ton today. Naturally these are estimates; these cargoes fluctuate, and the negotiation of the freight fluctuates.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BONNER was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, it is impossible to substantiate the statement that the effect of a 50 percent carriage by the American flag lines would in addition to the alleged excess expenditures referred to above result in substantial increase in world rates.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. In just a minute—In the case of Korea, Japan, and the Chinese continent, the area to which our Government is presently shipping, admittedly supply and demand always have some effect on the measure of tramp rates, foreign rates as well as American flag rates. However, American flag participation along with foreign flag participation is a proven stabilizing factor

in preventing skyrocketing rates; and anyone who has looked into the history of international shipping will find that statement to be true.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. As I understood the remarks made by the gentleman from Louisiana who preceded the gentleman from North Carolina, unless we defeat the Poage amendment the merchant marine of this country is going to be left in very, very bad condition. Now, suppose we did not pass the bill where would the merchant marine be?

Mr. BONNER. No; the merchant marine would not be in bad position. The ships that would carry this cargo are not subsidized.

Mr. ABERNETHY. They would be just as well off as they are now if we decided not to deliver the wheat to Pakistan.

Mr. BONNER. It is an essential part of the industry of America to keep these American tramp flagships sailing. If you want to take the tramp ships which have been the backbone of our national defense in emergency off of the ocean, then fix it so when time and opportunity offer freight on the high seas that they cannot participate in it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. May I ask one other question: Are we not setting the precedent that any time hereafter we decide to give somebody on the other side of the world something they cannot even come and get if they want to, but that we must send it to them ourselves?

Mr. BONNER. I do not know whether Congress establishes a precedent by an act that we might do today; it can be changed in the next Congress. In answer let me say to the gentleman that 50 percent of the wheat we sent to India was carried in American bottoms.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman knows more about that than I. Of course, India is supposed to have bought the wheat they got from us.

Mr. BONNER. I care not whether it was bought or given to them; we have two nations here that are living side by side.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That was a cheaper deal than this one.

Mr. BONNER. We help one of them to get wheat which help we deny to the other, and then there is the religious question which has been spoken of. We have been blessed by God Almighty with bounteous crops; our granaries are overrunning. The Agriculture Committee and the Congress have helped the farmers; we are all getting along well; we have more grain than we can possibly use. Where can we sell it? Here are people destitute. As the minority leader of the House said, this is a charity matter.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Along the line of precedents, I would like to point out that in the case of the wheat that was sent to Yugoslavia we paid the freight. In the case of billions of dollars' worth of goods that were sent all over the world by UNRRA, for which we paid practically

all the cost, following the war years, we not only paid the ocean freight but we paid the cost of distribution in the countries. So, no matter what we do here as far as paying the freight is concerned, we are not setting any precedent.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Maybe that was the reason for UNRRA folding up.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I conclude with this statement—and it is properly debatable—but it is my opinion, knowing just a little something about the American merchant marine, if this provision is written into the bill, it will cost Pakistan or the United States Government or somebody if this wheat is to be delivered to Pakistan far more than if we ship 50 percent of it in American tramp vessels because it will be a balance and a check, one on the other.

I hope the pending amendment will be defeated.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall support the amendment. I regret that this discussion about the American merchant marine gets into the argument stage. I am supporting this amendment because I believe that the United States, which is making a gift of this wheat, should not be called upon to spend an additional twenty some-odd-million dollars in paying the freight on it.

I may say that if Pakistan was not deriving some money from the sale of a portion of the wheat, and a sufficient amount of money to pay the freight on the entire amount of wheat, I would probably not be opposing this amendment.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. May I say that I am not too impressed with the argument that has been made regarding the need of the merchant marine. If they need a subsidy, the thing for them to do is to come before the proper committee of the Congress and ask for it. That is the proper way to get it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I thank the gentleman. May I give my further reasons for supporting this amendment.

I do not think that the representatives of the MSA were completely honest with the committee when they appeared before it. They realized that this bill made no reference to the delivery of the wheat or who should pay for the cost of transportation. The Administrator did say that they were coming before our committee with this bill to gain authority to give the wheat. He also intimated that they might use funds which MSA has for buying wheat, but, in effect, they were getting additional money by this bill. As I said before, Pakistan will realize enough money from the sale of wheat from those who can pay to pay for this freight.

Another thing, Mr. Stassen did not tell us that Pakistan would be asked to pay any part of this bill. Again I say, I do not believe the MSA was entirely frank with the committee.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas, the chairman of our committee.

Mr. HOPE. I simply want to point out to the gentleman that no matter how much Pakistan derives from the sale of this wheat in rupees, there are no ships in the world today, outside of the few Pakistanian ships, that can be hired for rupees. Of course if they could sell it for dollars or sterling to their own people they could get money from the sale of the wheat which they could use in hiring the ships; but as long as it is in rupees they cannot possibly hire any shipping.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Well, if the rupee is the medium of exchange there in Pakistan, evidently they have some provision for making some exchange because they do carry on commerce with other parts of the world, and they can arrange for some money. I am saying that the Pakistan Government will be selling enough of this wheat in the medium of exchange of their own country sufficient to pay the entire transportation cost.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should not become confused about this shipping matter at all. I am sorry it has been injected. I regret it, and I do not think it is going to hurt the American shippers so far as that is concerned, with this apparently small sum. I would have felt much better if the MSA had come before this committee and said, "Now, we are going to ask for authority to have this wheat taken from the surplus stocks, and then we are going to ask for an additional authority or an appropriation of, say, \$5 million," I would go along with that, "to pay for part of this transportation." But when you talk about what we are talking about here today, and concur in the amendment offered in the Senate, you are going to add another \$25 million or \$26 million to this bill, and that is the thing I am opposed to. I am for giving the wheat, and I think that is fine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let me say this in the beginning that I think everybody in this controversy over whether or not this amendment should be adopted is sincere. I heard a great deal of the testimony before the Committee on Agriculture, and I testified myself on this bill. I think most of the interpretations that have been made here have been interpretations as these men have understood the facts to be. However, may I say in answer to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]—and he made a very able argument for his position here a few minutes ago. This, if we are going to save a lot of money I would kindly ask him and some of the others who argue here today if they would be willing also for us to appropriate the money and to purchase this wheat at \$1.83 instead of \$2.46, which is the loan value which was taken by the Commodity Credit Corporation on this wheat which is now being transferred to Pakistan. Now, it would

be possible, if we wanted to take the subsidy out of it, to perhaps effect a saving of \$23 million by buying it at \$1.83. But I do not think the gentleman from Texas would be willing to make that sacrifice.

I do not believe it is reasonable to ask that the shipping industry here should be willing to make the same kind of a sacrifice any more than he would be willing to make on Texas wheat. I think it would be just as reasonable for them to ask us people to knock off 50 cents a bushel as it would be for us to take the subsidy out of ships which we might need in the next war. I think it is just as reasonable to assume one as the other. That would be my answer to the question of shipping 50 percent of this in American bottoms.

I am afraid that we are losing sight of the important issue, as I see it here, and that is that we are here attempting to do something in favor of a friendly ally. If we are going to ask them to take so much of their money and to put it in the form of transportation, are we in any way going to ask them to risk their own economic condition, which we are attempting to cure? I think we are, because it has been repeatedly pointed out that that would be the result. But, what I think we are losing sight of in the House is this important feature. That if we ask them to do that, we are taking out from under their economy certain moneys that are needed in backing up their currency. Whether you call it dollars or rupees I do not think is important. They certainly do not have any dollars which they could do this job with. The lowest figure that they could transport this is about \$12 million. If they take all of the dollars they have—and they only have about \$7 million—if you take all of that, why you would be short \$5 million if you take every single dollar they have available to pay for the cost of the transportation in dollars. If you take it in rupees as the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture has pointed out, there is not an American shipping company that would be willing to accept pay in rupees. Now, I do not know whether you would be able to find other world shipping that would be willing to take it or not. The important problem is not to undermine the economy of Pakistan at the same time that we are trying to give them the benefit of our generosity.

In answering the gentleman here, I certainly do not want in my own area to pull the support price out from under wheat, which it would be necessary to do if we appropriated money and purchased this wheat on the market at the lowest dollar market we could find.

In the second place, I believe that we do want to accomplish the purpose for which this bill was introduced, and that is to do a friendly act for a friendly ally and at the same time not undermine the economy of that country.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I commend the gentleman on the statement he has made, because he has demonstrated a grasp of

the true facts that are involved. He has certainly presented a case that ought to bring about the defeat of this amendment. I want to associate myself with what the gentleman has said.

In other words, it has already been established that we have the wheat. We have more wheat than we know what to do with. I am afraid a lot of it is going to be spoiling one of these days. Here is a friendly people that we can help with this great resource of which we have such an abundance. To undertake to give it to them and then require them to pay would result in my opinion in one of two things happening. Either they would have to forego the acceptance of the gift of wheat because they do not have the money or, if they pay their last dollars, or sterling, or gold, or whatever they have, to transport the wheat, then we would bring down economic disaster on the country, which in the long run would do them more harm than good.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment because I think it would be a departure from the precedent we set when we made the gift of wheat to India. You cannot make fish of one and fowl of the other. We cannot discriminate in form of India as against Pakistan.

This bill generally involves a million long tons of wheat, 37 million bushels, now held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. That Corporation holds 475 million bushels of surplus wheat, or 13 million long tons, valued at about a billion dollars. That surplus wheat hangs like the Damoclean sword over the surplus wheat market.

The observation was made by the gentleman from Texas that this gift of wheat to Pakistan is a Santa Claus offer. To my mind, that comment is as cruel as it is tragic. It is sort of turning our back upon human misery. We dare not, we cannot approach this problem with any kind of smug security or with any apathy. The Pakistani are in distress. We cannot shun them. We send this wheat in an enlightend self-interest. It is not mere charity. Rich dividends will be yielded to us—dividends of friendship and good will.

Pakistan is a staunch ally. Goodness knows we need allies all over the world. Her growing strength contributes to democratic world stability. It is a case of long-range, economic strategy—the sending of this wheat—and it will reward us handsomely.

I speak not only as a Member of this House but also as a member of the board of trustees of the India League, founded to cement relations of amity and accord between the United States and India. Pakistan has been beset with troubles. She has gone from one crisis to another, yet her people have shown the wisdom, steadfastness, industry, and courage that enabled her to survive those crises.

First, you may remember, she was compelled to override the sad loss of her founding father, Jinnah. Then she had to overcome the tragic assassination of

Jinnah's greatest disciple, Liaquat Ali Khan.

She has built up new industries, encouraged technical education, and she has above all exercised good sense, common sense, in all her international affairs. On many an occasion when the United States needed the vote of Pakistan at the United Nations, that vote was forthcoming. Now she is in the grip of a food shortage and famine threatens to stalk the land. Remember there are many fanatical Moslem groups in India who will take advantage of this economic difficulty, and take advantage of this misery and suffering, and demagogues are bound to whip-scourge the illiterate people into a frenzy and fury against the government. The starving, you know, are easy prey to the political agitator. There is difficulty in the relations between India and Pakistan, and famine with the resulting demagogic speeches that may be made will exacerbate those relations between Indian and Pakistan. We need rest—not unrest in that part of the world. I can assure you that Pakistan requires more than mere kind words and kindly observations if she is to overcome her lack of food. You know an empty stomach is not a good adviser. Those who have empty stomachs are easily preyed upon by the mischief makers. I think it was Homer who once said, "The belly is the commanding part of the body."

The mind is indeed subservient to a hungry stomach. No one knows this better than the rabble rousers. Going back to the unfortunate disputes between Pakistan and India, I point out that the 4 rivers of the Punjab are a source of trouble between the 2 countries. The headwaters of these streams are controlled by India. Pakistan needs these waters as well as India. Charges and countercharges are made. This strife gives additional impetus to the extremists who clamor for a showdown with India over Kashmir and over other issues. We need peace and amity in this part of the world. Peace there is in our interest. The giving of wheat to India has helped the cause of good will and peace. This bill for Pakistan will again further peace by stifling the strident voices of fanatics.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of friendship and in view of the fact that our bins are bulging with surplus stocks of wheat, all logic and common sense and humanity requires that we send forth this wheat.

I quote from a dispatch of the New York Herald Tribune as being symptomatic or indicative of the keen friendship which exists between the United States and Pakistan:

The exuberantly pro-American sentiments of Pakistan's new premier, Mohammed Ali, came under sniping today during his first regular press conference, but the former Ambassador at Washington remained steadfast in expressing warm friendship for the United States—

Said a dispatch from Karachi by Homer Bigart in the New York Herald Tribune of April 24.

In addition to the vast quantity of wheat which the Government owns, there are large stocks of corn valued at \$410 million, vast numbers of bales of

cotton, tons of butter. Certainly, we who have should not withhold from those who have not.

It is interesting to note that Malcolm Johnson has just completed a series of articles, published by the New York Journal American and other Hearst newspapers, urging that our surplus food stocks be used to relieve the misery of people in famine areas. At the end of my speech I include herewith a statement of Malcolm Johnson's concerning wheat to Pakistan. The New York Journal-American is to be commended for publishing this article.

IKE BACKS WHEAT LOAN TO PAKISTAN—SENDING OF UNITED STATES FOOD OVERSEAS HELD VITAL WEAPON AGAINST REDS

(By Malcolm Johnson)

The value of United States food donations as a powerful weapon against communism was emphasized today by private American welfare agencies now urging the Government to release more of its huge and mounting surplus food stores for the relief of hungry millions overseas.

Agency officials also stressed the great advantage of their policy in distributing foreign aid on a people-to-people basis, with a minimum of redtape, so that the recipients know it is a voluntary expression of friendship and good will direct from the American people.

After a White House conference with GOP congressional leaders yesterday, the Eisenhower administration promised to support legislation to lend 1 million tons of wheat to famine-stricken Pakistan.

House Speaker MARTIN, of Massachusetts, said the wheat bill would be introduced later this week. Details of the loan, including the price to be charged for the wheat, will be worked out later.

TRAGEDY SEEN

Commenting on the growing United States food surplus problem, as the Government continues to acquire tons of food under the farm-price-support program, Paul French, executive director of CARE, the nonsectarian relief agency, said:

"It would be a major tragedy if any of the millions of tons of surplus food now held by the Government should be permitted to go to waste or rot, while private agencies, such as CARE, have been trying for 3 years to release it where it will do the most good—in the starving areas of the world."

As an example of what can be done, French cited CARE's job in distributing some \$30 million worth of Government-donated food in Yugoslavia in 1950-51.

POLITICAL VALUE

CARE distributed the food among some 4 million of Yugoslavia's needy, and they were aware that it was a voluntary act of friendship from the American people.

As a result, French said, Marshal Tito volunteered the comment that it would now be "most difficult" to persuade the people of Yugoslavia to become "anti-American."

While the political value of such action cannot be overlooked, especially in view of Communists' attempts to exploit the United States food surplus situation, relief agency officials observed:

"For the hungry man with a hungry family in India, say, it is not enough to tell him that the United States is appropriating X billions of dollars for foreign aid.

"All he knows is that he and his family are still hungry. It will mean much more to him personally to give him food on a direct, personal basis. That's exactly what the private welfare agencies are doing overseas."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I have the honor of being cosponsor of this measure with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. Chairman, I think one thing we ought to get very clear in this situation, and which dictated my own interest in it last April when I introduced a resolution expressing it, as the sense of the Congress that Pakistan should be helped in her famine crisis. We have heard in eloquent words our colleagues here talking about the friendship between the people of Pakistan and the people of the United States. We have heard our colleagues speak of the humanitarian principles involved, and about our surplus wheat, and about the problems of our shipping industry. But may I submit to the committee that this bill raises a question of high statecraft and of high policy.

It is not every nation in the world concerning which the President sends us a message asking for special assistance to deal with food needs. The President sent us a message on this Pakistan crisis, and for a very important reason, for when our people came back from the Middle East, our Secretary of State and our Mutual Security Administrator, it was clear to them, and it was made clear to the whole country that the two strongest bastions of the defense of the free world in the whole Middle East, which is an extremely vulnerable area, are Turkey and Pakistan.

One of the keys to its capability to be such a bastion is Pakistan's general financial condition and her general ability to go forward with her own development program. Pakistan is normally a solvent country. Normally Pakistan's balance of payments is good and it holds its own. Normally Pakistan feeds itself. She has had two very bad years which have not only imperiled her in terms of food production, but imperiled, as my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] so eloquently explained, her financial situation.

Let us understand very clearly, then, the basic reason for opposition to this amendment. Certainly it is very material in the foreign policy of the United States that we should do everything we can to strengthen Pakistan's position, not to weaken it, or not to look at it in strictly commercial terms. Because, in strictly commercial terms, a strong posture of defense as the bastion on the east of the whole line of the free world in a tremendously vulnerable area, in the Middle East, far exceeds in value anything that is involved in the amount we will have to pay for transporting this wheat.

Looking at it in that way, let us not vitiate the effect of what we are doing to help the people of Pakistan by this amendment. And I deeply believe this amendment will vitiate it.

One other point. One of the things that hurts Communists worst in the Middle East—and we certainly like to see that—is that they made India pay on the barrelhead for less than a hundred thousand tons of wheat at a time when India very badly needed help, and

at very high prices. This vitiated every pretense the Communists made about helping the people of that area of the world. Let us not be guilty of the same mistake for what is, relatively speaking, considering the stakes we have that are involved, small amounts of money. Let us not vitiate the impact of this gift upon the whole Moslem world, of which Pakistan is the leader. Let us remember that Pakistan defends 800 miles of the strategic border along Lukiang of Communist China, at a time of great danger from Communist China as far as the free world is concerned.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The Communists hurt themselves, not only in India but all through southeast Asia, when the facts were known about the high price they set on the wheat for India, more than by anything else they have done. They did themselves more damage and they lost more standing in that area of the world by their own act than by anything our whole information program has ever done.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly. By making India pay on the barrelhead and treating this as a commercial transaction, the Communists, we were glad to see, vitiated their own position. Let us not be guilty of the same mistake.

[Mr. LONG addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, this is not two problems, it is one problem. It is not a problem of what to do about surplus wheat, and what to do about freight rates; the problem is what America will do for a free nation in trouble. That has been well stated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER]. This Nation has never renounced its humanity, and we are not going to renounce it in this situation; but it would be a grave mistake for us to believe that we are accomplishing anything if we say: "Here the wheat is, come and get it." It is not that simple for the people of Pakistan or the Government of Pakistan. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] was convincing on that point. It would be better not to attempt it at all than to do it in a way that leaves the task unaccomplished.

Some years ago my State was the victim of a terrible drought. The people of South Dakota hearing of our disaster—and there was real hardship and hunger and privation, there was genuine suffering, the people of South Dakota sent us a trainload of grain. They did not send word to Arkansas that the grain was there, that we should come and get it; they sent carloads of grain and they paid the freight on it; and I have a deep feeling of friendship today toward South Dakota, a deeper feeling perhaps because they came to the rescue of my State in time of famine.

Now, we want to be businesslike about it, and we must be businesslike. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], if I might remind the House, stated it.

That part of the freight that Pakistan can pay will be paid under the terms of the bill as written. If the amendment offered by my friend the gentleman from Texas is adopted that money could not even come out of funds we provided in the mutual-security bill the other day.

So I hope that the House in its good judgment, much as we appreciate the earnest efforts of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] will leave this bill intact so that the Mutual Security Administration can determine just what can be paid by the Government of Pakistan and how we can carry out the essential purpose of this legislation.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as a usual thing on matters in the House I follow my good friend from Texas [Mr. POAGE]. I find him on agricultural matters very sound. But I do just want to take a moment to say this: If somebody gives you something and you know they give it grudgingly, you cannot appreciate the gift. It is an idle gesture to say you are going to let Pakistan have a million tons of wheat and they not being able to avail themselves of it because in all probability they do not have the money to pay the freight. So it looks to me like when we have the wheat, when we have the ships, it is a little thing for us to do to make millions of people feel kindly to this great country of ours, because, let me repeat, as I have said so many times, with the world in the turmoil that it is today, looking to us for leadership and wanting many of them to go with us, if there was ever a time in this Nation's history when we need friends it is now.

If we are going to give the wheat to Pakistan let us not allow the impression to go out that we give it grudgingly, that any strings are tied to it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly agree with what our distinguished former Speaker said with respect to giving this freely and generously; it is the only way in which it should be given, and I am heartily in agreement with what the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] said, that this is a question of high policy, a question of high statesmanship. We need friends all over the world.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that perhaps our right hand does not know what our left hand is doing. Last month by a stroke of the pen, the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States impaired the economy of one of our friends in South America. Why did he do this? He did it simply to satisfy the wishes, the wants and the desires of a few people in this country who are interested in wool. By this action, the economy of a friendly country in South America, the friendly country of Uruguay, will be seriously hampered, a country which buys annually from us much more than we buy from them, a country which has always been friendly to the United States. By his action the Secretary of the Treasury has created a suspicion in the minds of every country in South America as to what our future policy may be with respect to trade and tariffs.

Mr. Chairman, the action which we will likely take this afternoon on the one hand indicates we are a generous people, and that we want to help our friends; but the action which the Secretary of the Treasury last month took indicates just the opposite. This Congress ought to emphatically reject the action of the Secretary last week, and I propose to offer such measures so as to accomplish that purpose.

If we say on the one hand that an executive officer of our Government can hurt the economy of a friendly country in South America, a near neighbor, and create suspicion in the minds of other friends of ours all over the world, what is the use of making this kind of a generous gesture today? Aid to Pakistan is an important matter, as our former Speaker has well said. We need friends all over the world. Mind you, Mr. Chairman, this action of the Treasury Secretary was unprecedented, never taken before under the same circumstances by this country.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to know if the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania is still of the opinion that the President should have the authority that he has under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to do what the gentleman says he has done?

Mr. EBERHARTER. In answer to the question asked by the gentleman from West Virginia, the Secretary of the Treasury should not have the power by a stroke of the pen to alienate the friends of the United States. This to me is a very serious matter. I tried to correct it by a motion in committee, but I was not successful.

It is my intention, Mr. Chairman, and I give notice to the Members of the House, that I expect to follow this effort through. If we are going to have a good neighbor policy for our South American friends, let us have a good neighbor policy. Let us not give in to the wishes of a few people who are interested in the wool market of the United States. It seems to me this is an appropriate time to prevent the United States being shown up to the world in a double capacity, on the one hand as friendly and generous, seeking friends, and on the other hand as alienating our friends by action that will make enemies and drive our friends from us.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I realize we are all now ready to vote on the pending amendment and I shall take but a minute of the time allotted me. I do want to associate myself with the remarks and opinions of the distinguished minority leader; the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the distinguished majority leader. I think their views are

the views that will be followed on this vote and I am sure that right and reason will prevail and that the pending amendment will be defeated.

I wish at this time to point out the parliamentary situation. Upon defeat of the pending Poage amendment, and I am confident it will be defeated, there will be offered by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL], an amendment which will provide that at least 50 percent of these wheat cargoes for Pakistan shall be carried in American-flag vessels. As has heretofore been pointed out, exactly the same provision has been adopted in every mutual security bill since the inception of the Marshall plan in 1948. It is now contained in the companion wheat for Pakistan bill, S. 2112, which has already been passed by the other body. Mr. Chairman, I am confident that this House today will defeat the Poage amendment and adopt the Weichel amendment which will follow.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, it seems to me that in the consideration of this bill there are more questions involved than appear at first sight. On most of them there is little or no disagreement. Let us look briefly at what we are proposing to do. On the one hand is a nation, newly formed, carved out of another nation that has existed as an organized society longer than any other nation on earth, save possibly her great neighbor on the north.

This has been proverbially a peaceful people. Other nations have flourished more than they, have established great dynasties, conquered many peoples, and have gone into oblivion. The people of Pakistan tilled their soil, reared their children, lived and died in their homeland since the time of Belshazzar and Cyrus the Great. They were a nation overrun by the armies of Alexander and yielded to power of the Macedonian phalanx, but they have continued to live on as a nation long after the Macedonian Empire has crumbled to dust. They carried on through the Roman Republic, through the Roman Empire, and today the living representatives of that ancient people can view the crumbling pantheons and arches of triumph of all the great nations of history right down to our own time.

Now a segment of that great people is in distress. They have not bled themselves white in bloody wars. Their workmen have not builded great pyramids under the lash of a task master. They have not erected great temples while the people lived in hovels. No, their want has arisen because nature, not in the providence of God, but in the course of the immutable laws of the universe, has denied them the rainfall essential to produce the food necessary to their living.

This is a panorama of the people whose distress we are considering today. I have heard it said a number of times in the course of remarks on this floor that these people are our friends, that if

we help they will help us, or at least they will not turn against us. Therefore, it is a good policy to help them. In other words, we can trade them wheat for their support. Yet we want to call it a gift. That cannot be. There can be no gift where something is expected in return. Where there is a quid pro quo there is no gift. It is plain barter. If any payment is expected, it is a barter and nothing else.

We call ourselves a Christian Nation, and I sincerely hope that we are, but before we boast too loudly of our Christianity, let us first find out what Christianity is. Jesus of Nazareth was the founder of Christianity. I think we will all agree on that. He ought to know what the "way of life," as He put it, is intended to mean. The report has it that in the latter day of His short 2 years of teaching, fearing that He would be misunderstood, He set out just what his teaching should mean in human conduct. He drew before His hearers a word picture of the Judgment Day. He pictured a man who had held high office in the church, who professed to have cast out devils and to have done many wonderful works in the name of Jesus. Yet the Master and Judge said unto him:

Depart from me ye worker of iniquity; I never knew you—I was an hungered and ye gave me no meat, thirsty and ye gave me no drink, naked and ye clothed me not, sick and imprisoned and ye visited me not.

And in answer to the question of the condemned man, the Master replied:

Inasmuch as ye did it not unto the least of these my brethren, ye did it not to me.

In that exemplification is embodied the sum total of Christianity. It lays down the law that man is his brother's keeper, a question which man has raised, and a law which he has tried to avoid ever since he developed enough brain to have a sense of right and wrong.

By that law of Christianity, no man can see a fellow man in distress and fail to come to his aid and yet call himself a Christian. If one of those people living in Pakistan were a next-door neighbor, not a Member of this body would take one swallow until he had furnished him food. We know that. Every Member here knows that. It is only simple human kindness and that is the essence, in my opinion, the sum total of Christianity.

The question then is this: "Shall we act as a Nation on the same high plane as we expect of ourselves as individuals? Is there a double standard of Christian conduct? One for the individual and another for the Nation?"

Members of Congress, we, as Christians, have no choice. We cannot, even if we would, shirk our responsibility as a Nation without compromising ourselves as individuals. We must not, and we cannot do it. We intend to meet the wants of our fellow men in Pakistan. There is no doubt as to that. It is only a question of the spirit in which we shall do it. Members of Congress, let us give this relief, not because the people of Pakistan are our friends, not because they are in a position to return the favor. Let us not give even as a matter of duty.

Let us give it because they are fellow human beings. Let us put our action today on a high plane, a plane worthy to be called Christian—on a plane worthy, as nearly as may be, of Him who gave his life, not for his friends, but for his enemies. Then will both the giver and the receiver be blessed. Then will be exemplified the truth of the beautiful words of a great American poet and statesman:

He gives nothing but worthless gold
Who gives from a sense of duty.
But he who gives but a slender mite
And gives to that which is out of sight,
The hand cannot hold the whole of his alms.
The heart outstretches its eager palms
And a God goes with it and makes it store
To a soul that was starving in darkness
before.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to the debate on this Pakistan relief measure. I heard the discussion in the Agriculture Committee and now I have sat here through it all, up to this point, in the Committee of the Whole House. It seems to me that the problem is a very simple one unless we want to make it complicated. The basic question in my mind is whether or not we are to contribute to the relief of starving people in a friendly nation. The President on the recommendations of his Secretary of State and the Administrator of the mutual security program comes to us with the recommendation that we ship whatever wheat is needed to Pakistan. Canada and Australia, according to my information, have already made just such a contribution.

If the people of Pakistan need the help, they need it now, and if we are to believe what the President has told us, it is necessary to deliver it to them.

I like the example used by my distinguished colleague from Texas, [Mr. POAGE] when he told about a custom that we who have lived in the country know very well. He spoke of how, if we had a surplus of watermelons we would tell our neighbors who did not have any to come on over and get whatever they needed. You can carry that old country custom just a little further. When the neighbors are truly distressed and sick and need some help, the first one to take a basket of food over to them would be my distinguished colleague; and if he and his family were distressed and unable to go and get help they needed, I think you will agree that his neighbors would come over bright and early in the morning to see what was needed and to deliver it to the door.

It seems to me that in this debate we have gone far afield. I have been a little confused as to whether this is all an attack on the merchant marine or whether it is an excuse for somebody to take some shots at my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas, BOB POAGE. I particularly resent some of the things that have been whispered in my ears about the author of this amendment. I want to say to you that anybody that ever criticizes my colleague from Texas and his motives,

where his heart lies, simply does not know him. His thoughts are his own and his actions are his own, but whatever he does, he is moved by what he believes to be right.

We are not talking about luxuries, watermelons, and whatnot in the Pakistan case. Those people are either hungry and need the help which the President has asked for or they do not need anything. If I were convinced that the request was a phony and it was not based on absolute necessity, I would not vote for the bill at all.

As to whether or not the wheat should be delivered to the distressed neighbor, I am perfectly willing to accept the judgment of Governor Stassen, Secretary of State Dulles, and President Eisenhower.

It may be that some of our colleagues who are so bitterly opposed to the American merchant marine and to the men who operate it, see in this bill an opportunity to take another shot at American shipping. They have been doing it ever since I have been in Congress, and I recall the fights that we have had every time it was proposed that half of our shipments abroad should go in American bottoms.

Now, let us take a quick look at the American merchant marine and see if you want to fight it or not.

There is only one reason for the American merchant marine and that is as an essential arm of our national defense. That is why we have it, and that is why we maintain it. That is also the reason why we subsidize it.

It was stated yesterday that if we require half of the Pakistan wheat to be shipped in American bottoms, it is a form of subsidy. If you want to take that position, go ahead, but remember that if the shipping of wheat in any ship is a subsidy, then we have a choice of subsidizing our own ships or of subsidizing the ships of Great Britain, or Greece, or Panama, or some other foreign nation. Pakistan does not have the ships to do the job. If you are worried about the subsidy that we pay to the American merchant marine, bear in mind that all we do is keep the workmen on our own vessels on substantially the same plane as the workers in other lines of endeavor—railroads, mines, steel mills, and so forth. If you are still worried about subsidies, you might bear in mind that every merchant marine in the world is subsidized. If you want to make a comparison of costs, you might bear in mind that it costs the American taxpayers about half as much to subsidize the American merchant marine as it costs to subsidize agricultural produce. Certainly it seems to me that there is something wrong with this whole argument, and we are getting far afield from the basic purpose of the bill, which is to feed a hungry neighbor.

(Mr. THOMPSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WEICHEL: On page 2, line 6, after the words "directed by the President", insert "at least 50 per centum of the gross tonnage of wheat made available under this act and transported from the United States on ocean vessels shall be so transported on United States flag vessels to the extent practicable and to the extent such vessels are available at market rates for United States flag vessels."

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, you have heard considerable discussion about the carriage of relief and aid cargo. I do not desire to burden you further but I do want to remind you that during the past war we built the greatest merchant fleet in the world to carry men, cargo, supplies, and munitions of war, to protect the United States. And during the postwar period of rehabilitation to assist nations to again take their places in the economy of the world, we have given aid to the countries of the world and our great fleet was used in carrying this aid. It has been an established policy of the Congress for many years past that at least half of this cargo should be carried in American flag ships when practicable. It is the opinion of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries that we should maintain this fleet for our own security. It is desirable that we give this fleet something to haul, therefore, with this in mind and with the view of the Congress that we should do all the things necessary with this merchant marine fleet so that it will insure our security, and the members of the Merchant Marine Committee desiring that the amendment be offered to the pending legislation whereby one-half of this wheat to Pakistan should be carried in American ships, I have offered this amendment.

I urge you to adopt this amendment, in view of the speeches made here today with reference to the bill and our own security.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In view of the statement made by Governor Stassen and reported by the chairman of the committee, does the gentleman think that this amendment is necessary; and would it not be done under the legislation which is now in effect which has been sponsored by the Mutual Security Administrator?

Mr. WEICHEL. Surely; it is desirable. The Senate thought it was well to put it in the bill.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I do not think the fact that they have done it means it is all right. I do not agree with the gentleman on that. I asked the gentleman if he did not think it would be anyway, even if this amendment were not approved.

Mr. WEICHEL. I think it is desirable to have this amendment, so there cannot be any misunderstanding.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I listened with interest to the gentleman's argument.

If I understood him correctly, it would be a fine thing for our own vessels to do this. But why not go all the way and, instead of shipping half this wheat in ships flying the American flag, ship all of it in that sort of ship?

Mr. WEICHEL. Maybe they will. Would the gentleman object to that?

Mr. ABERNETHY. No; I would be in favor of that; in view of the action the House took just a moment ago, I think that is what we ought to do.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. A representative of the maritime industry told us that it was doubtful that they would even have enough ships available to transport one-half of the wheat. He has definitely said that they could not transport all of it. He made no request that they be permitted to transport all of the wheat.

With reference to the suggestion made by my colleague from Missouri [Mr. JONES] as to the necessity for this amendment, I hardly see why it would be necessary, because the MSA people did not ask that this amendment be incorporated in the bill. This bill we reported from our committee only provides for the delivery of the wheat at ship side in our own port cities. Mr. Stassen told our committee that the freight would be paid from MSA funds. The MSA law provides that 50 percent of it shall be shipped in American ships. So it hardly seems necessary to have this provision.

Mr. WEICHEL. This is not straight MSA, is it?

Mr. COOLEY. That is correct; it is not straight MSA. That is the reason the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] with reference to payment of the freight did not come into the category of MSA appropriations at all, because this comes more or less in the category of the shipments that were made to India, when we required India to pay the freight.

Mr. WEICHEL. But this is desirable.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. I understand that the Mutual Security Administrator has indicated his intention to use American-flag ships for the carrying of at least 50 percent of this cargo. I wonder why, if that is his intention, he would have any objection to this body's writing it into the law.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman mean whether I would have any objection?

Mr. KEOGH. No, the mutual Security Administrator.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not think the Mutual Security Administrator has any objection, but the fact that he has not asked for it indicates that he does not think it is necessary. He was frank enough and forthright enough to say that they would pay the freight with MSA funds.

Mr. KEOGH. It is necessary to write it into the law; but he is not writing the law, we are.

Mr. COOLEY. Then it is up to the Congress to say whether we want to transport 50 percent of this wheat in American ships, when you know that it is going to cost twice as much to move the wheat that way than if you move it in foreign ships.

Mr. KEOGH. No; we recognize—

Mr. COOLEY. Do not say no; that is the testimony of the men who came before our committee. And the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] made the statement here that flag-ship rates were one thing and tramp-ship rates were another. Now the statement is clear that this wheat is going to be moved in flag ships, and therefore under flag-ship rates.

Mr. KEOGH. I recognize that the costs of American-flag ship operations are greater than the costs of other ships.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. KEOGH. We all recognize that. I do not want to labor this point with the gentleman. I know he is not going to oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following those of the gentleman from North Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. If the gentleman will yield to me, Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can clear this up.

There are berth liners that are American-flag ships. Then there are tramp, cargo carriers, bulk carriers. That is distinction that I was trying to make. The berth liner is more or less a package express cargo carrier.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows far better than I that the American Merchant Marine is not now unemployed.

Mr. BONNER. The cargo carrier, the tramp ship, is not subsidized. The berth liner is subsidized.

Mr. COOLEY. Before the gentleman finished his remarks he said that this wheat would move in American-flag ships, not in American tramp ships.

Mr. BONNER. They are all American-flag ships.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman means that tramp ships fly the American flag.

Mr. BONNER. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman also made the statement that to hold the rates down our Government had chartered certain ships. They were chartered to foreign governments; were they not?

Mr. BONNER. No, no.

Mr. COOLEY. We put them under charter.

Mr. BONNER. We charter to American operators.

Mr. COOLEY. All right; there is no misunderstanding about that. I think the issue has been well debated, and that everybody understands that we are going to force, as far as practicable, the American merchant marine to haul this grain so that the American merchant marine can make a profit and be employed. The fact is that the American merchant

marine is not now unemployed, and Pakistan has some ships they can send here. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] said it was an interior nation. I want to know, then, how ships are going to get to Karachi.

Mr. BOGGS. Possibly there was a mistake in that statement.

Mr. COOLEY. We are giving them the wheat and you want to send it over there. If you want to do that, that is all right.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to ask my distinguished friend, the ranking minority member and former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, whether or not it is the fact that the language of this pending amendment now offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL] was never considered in the Committee on Agriculture at the time the Pakistan wheat bill was considered?

Mr. COOLEY. May I suggest to the gentleman that the amendment was offered and then the matter was discussed just as the freight provision was discussed; and the particular amendment, which was defeated here a moment ago overwhelmingly, failed in the committee.

There is a strange situation here, Mr. Chairman, involving all foreign-aid programs. This is the first time that our committee has been asked to consider and to report anything in the way of a foreign-aid program. If you are going to keep the bookkeeping right so that the American people will know what is being done, then this \$100 million must be added to the foreign-aid bill we authorized last week.

One other thing: I asked the question yesterday, What is it that anyone on the floor of this House now knows about the horrible situation that we hear so much about in Pakistan which we did not know on the 16th day of June when the MSA bill came from the Foreign Affairs Committee? They brought it out and the Congress gave them \$27 million. Then they handed us this bill and want us to give them \$100 million—and do it as a gift. All right; if the House wants to do it, all right. I am going to vote for the bill but I am going to vote against this amendment.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, we must be certain that all American interests are protected to the greatest extent possible. This interest includes the American cargo and ship brokers.

Early in the war Congress passed the Bland Act, which became section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, which provided for "the maintenance and development of present and postwar foreign trade, and the preservation of forwarding facilities and services for the postwar restoration of foreign commerce."

This measure was necessary to correct the anomalous situation which resulted from foreign nations receiving American aid but designating nationals of their own country as recipients of American dollars for the privilege of arranging or

supervising shipping space, even on American-flag vessels.

The legislative history of the Bland Act shows clearly that it was the intent of Congress that the practices which excluded American freight forwarders and brokers from handling lend-lease shipments and other cargo purchased in this country must be eliminated.

Following the war, legislative and administrative provision was made for the full participation of American brokers in the various relief programs. For instance, during discussion in the Senate of the European recovery program, Senator Vandenberg stated:

It is our position that ERP cargo should in all cases be handled in accordance with the purpose of section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

Insofar as the various executive agencies of the United States Government have administered the various relief and recovery programs and have had control over the transportation services incidental thereto, the established ship brokers have been protected. However, in certain instances where the recipient foreign governments have procured their own transportation, there has been a tendency toward various abuses. In some instances, brokerage was paid for foreign ship brokers who had no duties to perform whatsoever. Another example is the situation where the foreign government appointed an exclusive broker in the United States who allocated shares in the brokerage to foreign brokers.

The proposed grant of wheat to the people of Pakistan is essentially a gift, and the transportation arrangements in connection with the wheat should be directed by the United States Government. Therefore, the arrangements for such transportation should be under the supervision of one of the agencies of the United States Government, and not only should 50 percent of the cargo be carried in American-flag vessels, but the charter arrangements to be made should be handled through established American brokers rather than through foreign brokers, who in most cases would be nationals of countries other than Pakistan, which is not a dominant shipping nation.

For the above-mentioned reasons, it should be clear legislative intent that the shipments of wheat to Pakistan shall be handled through the normal American commercial channels.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the members of the committee would like to know some of the facts in connection with the operation of the American merchant marine. I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio which seeks to place in this bill a provision which is similar to that which was put into all other similar bills in the past. I have particular reference, of course, to our mutual security program.

This amendment is in keeping with the policy which this House and this Congress has already adopted; it is also in keeping with a policy adopted by the Congress when it passed the 1936 Merchant Marine Act. That act recognized

the necessity for maintaining and keeping an adequate American merchant marine as the fourth or fifth arm of our national defense.

We must recognize that without Government aid we could have no American merchant marine. There has been some confusion here in connection with this subsidy matter. This wheat we are talking about is carried as bulk cargo and will not be carried in very great quantities by what we call our berth operators which are the subsidized lines. This cargo will be carried mostly by tramp shipping, and the tramp shippers are not subsidized at all.

You will be interested, while we are speaking about the welfare of the American merchant marine that in 1946 or soon after the end of World War II there were 1,000 tramp ships flying the American flag. Today there are 165 or 175 according to whose figures you take. Admiral Dennebrink says there are 165. The representative of the tramp fleet operators before our committee testified that there were 175; but that does not make much difference. The figures do indicate that between 1946 and today we have lost better than 800 American-flag tramp ships.

You will be interested to know also that in 1946 about 65 percent of American cargo was carried in American-flag ships. Last year that dropped down to 35 and a fraction percent. In the past few months the figure has dropped again to 24 percent. Obviously if only 24 percent of the American cargo is going to be carried in American-flag ships, and particularly does this apply to tramp operators, they are going to drop out of business because they cannot exist carrying cargo only one way. They have to carry cargo both ways. If we want to carry out the specified policy of our 1936 act, if we want to carry out the policy adopted in our mutual security program, this amendment should be adopted.

I grant it is in the nature of a subsidy and someone has suggested that these operators should come before the Congress and present their problem. May I say to the Members that the operators have come before our committee. They are presently before the Senate committee, presenting their problem to that committee and in time it may come to the floor of the House. In the meantime, we are considering this bill. Here is an opportunity to stabilize somewhat the operations of the American merchant marine.

I trust that the committee will adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Does the gentleman have any figures which would indicate exactly how much of this wheat is going to be carried by our tramp operators?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. No; I do not have the exact figures. All I can say is that the bulk of it will be carried by American operators.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. That is a very important thing for the House to recognize.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. In connection with the tramp operators who appeared before our committee, we asked their representative what they expected would happen to their tramp-shipping operations if the aid program came to an end. They said they would probably go out of business altogether.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I thought I understood the gentleman from Texas to say that this amendment would help the American merchant marine. Do you think we should apologize if we are helping our merchant marine, whether we be farmers, cottongrowers, or anyone else?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. No. The important thing is not so much that we help the individual farmers, the individual ship operators, the sailors, the ship chandlers, and all their employees, but the important thing is that we help the economy and welfare of the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. McCORMACK. My interpretation would be that instead of a subsidy this in connection with the carrying out of the act is a justifiable consideration of an important segment of American business.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. He is correct.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, ever since 1948 I have fought a consistent but losing battle trying to keep these foreign-aid measures from becoming subsidy measures for various phases of American business. If our merchant marine is in such shape that it needs additional subsidies, I am perfectly willing to have that great Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries consider that matter and bring it here on its own merits. But all through this so-called foreign-aid program it has been burdened down with this 50-percent shipping language which means that hundreds of millions of dollars of subsidies to American ships have come out of moneys that the Congress and the people thought they were spending for foreign relief or foreign aid.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. The point I want to make is, as I understand, the American-flag operator is not crying poverty. I am simply trying to have written into this bill the long-established objective of having American flagships carry half of the trade in and out of this country.

Mr. VORYS. The objective is quite clear. It is to require that part of this foreign aid, that could be carried cheaper otherwise, be carried the more expensive way by American ships, by a requirement imposed by law.

Your Committee on Foreign Affairs did not propose any basic revision of the 50-50 shipping requirement in the mutual security law, so that of the \$4.9 billion authorized the other day, one-half of whatever is appropriated to be shipped out of the country will be carried in American shipping, when it might have been hauled more cheaply.

But, I make this plea on this item today that is supposed to be really for aid to a starving country. It seems to me you could let the aid funds have a vacation from a shipping subsidy, and let it at least this time go by without writing in this requirement. If you put in a specific requirement like this, there will be a question whether this is for relief of Pakistan or of American shipping. If this is a relief from starvation proposition, suppose there is not an American ship, then do people over there starve while waiting for American ships? It seems to me, under the assurance given by the Mutual Security Administrator, we could be safe in leaving this out this time and not deliberately loading this particular item up with a number of millions of dollars' worth of subsidy to American shipping in a bill under the guise of relief to some stricken country.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We read in the papers about a threat of the merchant marine men going on a strike. How long that strike will last, if it begins, no one knows.

Mr. VORYS. If there is a strike so that American ships cannot move, then those folks face starvation, if this amendment is adopted.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Ohio how it is, since he was in charge of the bill only last week in behalf of the majority authorizing an appropriation for \$4.9 billion for the mutual security program, that he did nothing to carry out his viewpoint on this subject insofar as that bill was concerned, and particularly since the law in regard to mutual security shipments in American vessels is identical with the language which is now contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL]? Why did not the gentleman from Ohio do something about that last week?

Mr. VORYS. I will answer if you give me a chance. I attempted to answer. We did not desire to change the fundamental structure of the mutual security law in that regard. That means that we did not recommend any changes in that part of it, and therefore there will be hundreds of millions of dollars going to American shippers under the program authorized the other day. However, that certainly did not bar anyone of us from saying, "Please, do not load this special emergency relief bill up with relief money for American shippers."

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could have some understanding as to time to close debate on this particular amendment and all amendments thereto? Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, this is a matter, as I observed yesterday, that involves \$100 million. I have not spoken on the bill, and I would like to have 5 minutes.

Mr. HOPE. We are on the first section of the bill now, and there will be plenty of opportunity for the gentleman to discuss it fully under some other section. I was hoping we could complete debate on this particular amendment and then proceed to other sections of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I noticed you have been quite lenient this morning, some Members having been given 10 minutes. Now some of us would like to have 5 minutes. But I make no complaint about that.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BAILEY. Do I understand the proposal of the gentleman from Kansas would preclude debate beyond 15 minutes on all amendments to this section, or will it be confined to the Weichel amendment and amendments thereto?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the request of the gentleman to apply only to the pending amendment and all amendments thereto.

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. That, of course, would not foreclose the offering of further amendments.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was not considered in the executive session of the Committee on Agriculture at which the bill was approved. However, there was testimony before the committee on the part of Mr. Dulles, representing the State Department, that he had no objection to an amendment identical with this, which was adopted in the Senate bill. Mr. Stassen expressed himself to the same effect. In the letter from Mr. Stassen, which I read earlier in the day, it was stated that it was the expectation that approximately 50 percent of these cargoes would be carried in American ships.

I, therefore, see no objection to the amendment and personally I expect to support it. I am not in a position to say that the committee accepts it, but I do not see that the amendment would in any way affect the program, and since what it proposes is going to be done anyway, and it might prevent taking the bill to conference, I see no reason why the amendment should not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLARDY].

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, as one member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I want to go on record as opposing this amendment. There are a lot of things I should like to say about the bill, but I shall not take the time to do so now.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARDY. I yield.

Mr. DORN of New York. The gentleman says he speaks as one member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Is it not true that all the other members of that committee are on record as favoring this amendment?

Mr. CLARDY. I will take the gentleman's word for it, but I am used to being a lone wolf.

This amendment is no more than a subsidy for shipowners. If adopted, I certainly cannot vote for this bill. We have already paid out about a billion dollars to transport the giveaway program cargoes. How long can we continue this without going broke? Who will come to our rescue if a depression hits us? Let us think of ourselves for a while.

(Mr. CLARDY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted to Mr. BAILEY and to Mr. COUDERT was given to Mr. SMITH of Virginia.)

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say, and I guess I could have said it in a minute and a half, but there is not much to it any way. I talked about this bill a little bit yesterday when we were considering the rule because I was puzzled—I was deeply puzzled. I did not know what it was all about. I wondered why we were making India pay the freight and then giving it to these folks, and saying that we had to deliver this wheat at their doorstep and perhaps mill it, and grind it and bake it for them. I have found out now what this bill is all about. It has the wrong title. You Members can sit around here boasting about your charity, as you have done yesterday and today, and with all these high-flown sermons that we have been listening to about charity. There is not any charity in this bill so far as a number of the Members here are concerned. You ought to change the title of this bill. You have sat here all through today during this debate and heard a debate not over whether you were going to be charitable and give some wheat to Pakistan, but you have sat here and listened to a debate, a selfish debate, about whether you were going to spend \$100 million of the people's money in order to further subsidize to the extent of \$10 or \$12 million the ship owners of America. Is that not what you have been doing? Who is going to say "nay" to that? Gentlemen, let us not talk about charity. If the underlying motive here is that these folks who have got hold of the Merchant Marine, which belonged

to the United States, for little or nothing, and who have made great fortunes out of it, are to be subsidized to the extent of another \$10 or \$12 million by giving away \$100 million in the process, why do you not say so honestly and be frank about it? Let us change the title of this bill and say it is a bill for relief for Pakistan and the merchant-ship owners of the United States. That is what you are doing.

Mr. Chairman, I had expected to go along on this bill because I thought surely this House would say as long as India had to come and get it, Pakistan should come and get it. You have defeated that amendment, and I just do not feel like going ahead with this when you are not only to give them the wheat but carry it to their doorstep. Mr. Chairman, that is about all I have to say.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman made a very proper reference to one element of the relief factor in this bill. Is not the bill also for the relief of the wheat farmer in that it makes the taxpayer pay twice for this wheat?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. There was some discussion about that yesterday. Maybe it is all right—I do not know. We are giving all this money to Europe, Asia, Africa, and India, and maybe we ought to give some of it to the ship owners and the wheat growers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. HELLER].

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of talk about our merchant marine. I am of the view, we must do everything possible to encourage the growth and the further development of our merchant marine. This is an important segment of our economy and of invaluable significance to our national security. Only recently Rear Adm. R. E. Wilson told a subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, it is imperative for the United States to build up a merchant marine which is substantially greater than its present strength because of international uncertainties.

We must take heed of this warning and advice while we can and utilize every opportunity to help our merchant marine.

I was very much impressed with the speech made by the very able gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs]. In substance, he said, "Let us not take our merchant marine for granted." I repeat, let us not take our merchant marine for granted until war cracks around our heads and then find ourselves running around like mad trying to repair our neglect and carelessness. It happened during the last two wars and it is apparent to me that some here have not learned a lesson. We are the guardians of the merchant marine. President Eisenhower has said it is the fourth arm of our national defense, ranking with, but after the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Let us not treat it, however, as a stepchild. The Government has played just this role with our merchant marine for

too long instead of pressing it to its bosom in appreciation for past performances. I say we must give it equitable consideration with other elements in our economy. It is about time we appreciated how vital it is in peace and war. You can help to encourage and develop our merchant marine—you can do it by voting in favor of the Weichel amendment.

(Mr. HELLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN].

(Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I rise merely to answer one of the statements made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] who indicated that the adoption of the Weichel amendment might cripple the program by delaying—I believe those were his words—by delaying the shipment of needed wheat because of the lack of shipping space. The amendment specifically takes care of that situation by providing “to the extent practicable.” In other words, if it is practicable to send the wheat, then it will be shipped as is indicated by the amendment and not otherwise.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. How long is practicable? How long would they have to wait for an American ship?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. When people are starving, the time factor is vital. “To the extent practicable” would in this case mean at the earliest possible moment. Should any long delay be involved then other than American ships would be utilized.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Does not the testimony before our committee indicate that there are a number of tramp vessels available almost immediately to carry this bulk cargo?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. The testimony presented before our committee indicated the general availability of tramp vessels.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY].

(By unanimous consent Mr. ROONEY and Mr. DORN of New York yielded their time to Mr. SHELLEY.)

Mr. SHELLEY. I thank the gentlemen for yielding me their time.

Mr. Chairman, I think the time has come when we should review a little history about why this policy was first established.

After World War II, this country had a great number of vessels and we put some of those vessels up for sale and we sold them. At that time the foreign countries did not have a great number of vessels. There was a dearth of foreign vessels, because they had been lost

during the war; and a great many of ours also had been lost. Just as in World War I, during World War II everybody—the people from Texas, the people from Mississippi, the people from Ohio—who had sons and who were themselves going and who had relatives going abroad in the armed services, resented the fact that at times they had to sail in foreign vessels, whose standards were not up to American vessels. They did not have the sanitary or safety facilities, or anything else that we have in American ships in keeping with American standards.

We spent billions of dollars to build American vessels, manned by trained and competent American people, qualified to serve in the Reserve forces of the United States Navy, to transport our young men to foreign places. We recognized that during those periods we needed an American merchant marine.

As a result of our experiences after World War I, when we saw the merchant marine go down, Congress made a study and wrote the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, which Congress has supported since, and which says that we need a merchant marine. But we cannot have a merchant marine and have young Americans man those ships if they are going to receive pay at foreign standards, food at foreign standards, and live under foreign conditions. So, therefore, we must subsidize that service, so that we may have ships in time of emergency, American ships upon which we can depend and not foreign vessels the use of which we could not depend upon in dangerous times.

So we agree we need a merchant marine. Since we agree we need a merchant marine, the people in that industry, American merchants and the American Government, have fought consistently through all the years to see that some American goods were carried in the American vessels, so that they would have something to do. It does not make sense for us to start the building of them, to subsidize the operation of them, and then give them nothing to carry.

When we started foreign aid there was a movement, and people in the State Department encouraged the movement, for the use of foreign vessels. They said, “Let us help friendly nations who are in the maritime trade and use their vessels,” and we started laying our vessels up. That was after we had paid to build them and while we were paying to subsidize their operation. There was no freight for the merchant marine we all agreed we should have for our security.

So, as a result, the policy was established that at least 50 percent of this material that we give to these countries, or lend to them, such as under the Marshall plan or under mutual security, should go in our vessels so that we would not be wasting the money that we spent to build them and the money we paid to subsidize the operation of them; so that we could keep them alive and keep them going. The Weichel amendment simply continues that policy.

Why is it offered here today?

Because the wheat-for-Pakistan bill comes to the floor under the manage-

ment of the Committee on Agriculture whereas previous aid bills have heretofore been heard and handled by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The latter committee has recognized the justice of the 50-percent shipping provision for some years and would probably, I feel, have included the provision. The Committee on Agriculture, well informed as they may be on agricultural matters, are not informed, evidently, on maritime matters. That is evidenced by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], and some of the statements concerning rates, availability of vessels, and the resultant market effect of shipping this wheat.

The Weichel amendment might never have been brought to the floor today if it had not been for the threat to the American merchant marine underlying the Poage amendment, and some of the uninformed statements on these matters which we members of the Merchant Marine Committee have heard yesterday and today. With this threat to the established principle of 50-percent carriage in American-flag vessels we could not stand by. When we hear the 50-percent provision attacked as a subsidy to the American merchant marine we of the Merchant Marine Committee who work with the problem daily and know and understand the situation find ourselves at a loss to understand why such a charge should be made. It seems particularly strange to us that the gentlemen from the Agriculture Committee, who have the support of most of us from the big shipping centers on their frequent requests for agriculture subsidy funds, should be attacking it even if it were a subsidy, which it decidedly is not. I find it hard to believe that they are saying, “Give our farmers a subsidy, but don’t give it to any other branch of the American economy. Give it to the farmers but don’t give support, or assistance, or call it what you will, to any other industry.” I would like to call the House’s attention to the simple fact that through the last 6 years—since 1946—the net losses on American farm price-support programs—the cost to the taxpayer of subsidizing farm production—have amounted to \$1,150 million. During approximately the same period the net cost to the Government of all maritime-subsidy programs has been only a little over \$268 million. Why is subsidy all right in one case and not in the other? Does the mere fact of living inland make an American workman, no matter what his occupation, any more deserving of Government help than a seaman engaged in an equally vital occupation?

The question of American shipping rates has been raised. It has been said that they are high, out of all proportion to what they should be. The rates paid by those who ship aboard American vessels certainly cannot be called a subsidy. No matter what flag a vessel is flying, the shipper must pay freight charges—and in regular berth liner service, foreign or American, where ships have regularly scheduled sailings, the rates are set by international conference and are identical. Let us hope that clears up

some of the misconceptions on that point. If the cargoes are to move in tramp vessels, which go where the cargo takes them, there is a world market and there are world market quotations which the American tramp operator must meet on a competitive basis if he is to get any cargo. The only differences between American rates and foreign rates are due to the differences between American wage and living standards and foreign standards. I trust that our friends from the Agriculture Committee are not trying to say that they want support for American living standards for the farmer but that they do not want to support those standards for the man who goes to sea.

Right here and now is the time to straighten out this question of comparative rates and comparative costs as between American and foreign shipping. We have heard a discussion of the problem quoting Admiral Denebrinck, head of the Military Sea Transportation Service of the Navy. With all due respect for the admiral, whom I regard very highly as an exceedingly able naval officer, I do not consider him an authority on the merchant marine. The admiral's job is to operate the Navy's supporting fleet of merchant-type vessels, and I might add that the Merchant Marine Committee at this time is going into the operations of his organization because of the fact that they have spread their operations beyond what they were set up to do and are competing directing with the American merchant marine.

Instead of consulting Admiral Denebrinck, I have checked with Mr. Charles Maguire, head of the National Shipping Authority in the Maritime Administration—the agency which has handled our previous aid shipment cargoes and who is in a position to know more about shipping conditions, availability of vessels, and shipping rates than anyone else I can think of. Mr. Maguire advises me that it is his best estimate, based on his sound knowledge of present and probable future conditions within the next 6 months when this grain will be shipped, that regardless of what flag the vessels will fly, availability of ships will dictate that about 250,000 tons, one-quarter of the wheat will have to be carried on berth liners—regularly scheduled ships—and about 750,000 tons on tramps. He also gives it as his best estimate that the berth liner rates, regardless of the flag they fly, will be about \$18 per ton, averaging out the rates from the various ports at which the grain will be loaded. He gives as his best estimate of foreign-tramp rates a quotation of \$14 per ton. He gives as his best estimate of American tramp rates a price of \$21 per ton.

Now, using these figures as a base, and assuming that 50 percent of the wheat is carried aboard American vessels and 50 percent aboard foreign vessels, which will be the approximate situation if the Weichel amendment is approved to conform with the Senate bill, the total cost of shipment will be \$17,625,000. Using these same figures, if all the wheat was carried aboard foreign vessels the total cost would be \$15 million. I say that the \$2,625,000 difference is a small price to

pay to assure an actively operating American merchant marine in the interests of national security.

Incidentally, the bogey which Admiral Denebrinck raises about a sharp rise in rates if this provision carries is strictly that. If he were as familiar with the American merchant marine as Mr. Maguire or as the members of the Merchant Marine Committee, he would know that there is a very effective way, used in past aid cargo shipments, to prevent that happening. The National Shipping Authority, if rates threaten to get out of line, can simply bring a few ships out of the layup fleet, operate them under general agency agreements, and by that device keep the rates where they should be. After that statement was made on the floor yesterday, although I knew it was an uninformed opinion, to say the least, I checked with the National Shipping Authority. I was assured—and the figures quoted to me by Mr. Maguire on anticipated rates bear this out—that past experience indicated no such likelihood. The charter market is subject to normal fluctuations, but it is not anticipated that the 1,000,000-ton wheat shipment will affect it to any substantial degree.

Mr. Chairman, to sum up, I want to come back to the point I made in the earlier part of my remarks when I dwelt on the importance of the American merchant marine as a national safeguard. Those who continually snipe at the merchant marine through such tactics as the Poage amendment just do not know what they might be doing to our national security should their tactics work. We cannot fight a war without a going merchant fleet at its outbreak any more than the Pakistanians will be able to exist without this wheat, nor any more than this country could keep its people alive without the farm crops which we now pay such a high price to support. When we measure the national security against the \$2,626,000 the Weichel amendment might cost, it is a very small price, indeed, and I urge my colleagues who have the national interest and not a phoney economy at heart to support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] for 1¼ minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL].

The amendment was agreed to.

(Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this section?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY: Page 2, line 6, after the word "President" and after the period insert "Provided, That the Presi-

dent acting through the Commodity Credit Corporation shall set aside 1 ton of wheat for every 100 tons allocated to Pakistan under this act to be held in reserve for distribution, on application by proper State and local officials, to areas within the continental United States that are presently in need. The distribution, payment, and delivery to be on the same terms and conditions as are deliveries to Pakistan."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that none of my colleagues will infer from this amendment that I am opposed to the basic idea of extending it to Pakistan. It will be recalled that I supported during the 82d Congress the proposal to grant emergency grain to India. I did it in the well of the House, and I remember making the statement there which it might be well for my colleagues to ponder today. I said: "Mr. Speaker, when I go back and face my constituents in the coming campaign"—that was the campaign of 1952—"about the best explanation I will have for supporting the emergency grant of grain to India will be the same excuse offered by my friend Sam who was brought up one time before the magistrate and charged with throwing a brick through a plate glass window. The justice asked him: 'Sam, why did you do that?' Sam said: 'Your Honor, at the time I thought it was the proper thing to do.'" Probably it is the proper thing to do to support this amount of grain for Pakistan with some extenuating circumstances, and there is one of them I want to call your attention to in support of this amendment.

I do not want to hear, and I do not want to use, the threadbare phrase: Charity begins at home; I want you to look upon this as a well-thought-out plan, a businesslike approach, if you please. What I am asking in this amendment is that when we grant Pakistan 100 tons of wheat we set aside in a reserve 1 ton that may be consumed in the future, not alone in my State of West Virginia but in any area that is presently in need of assistance. There is such a condition in the State of West Virginia today not brought about by the State of West Virginia but brought about by the Federal Government through the operation of the reciprocal trade agreements program. In our coal mines there are 42,000 miners out of employment; consequently, 11,000 or 12,000 railroad men who man the trains which haul the coal are out of employment. Over 11,000 of those men have drawn all of their unemployment compensation funds. There are areas in the State of West Virginia, the largest coal producing State in the Union, in which there are towns up to 2,000 population where the mine is closed, the company store is closed, three-quarters of the people are on relief.

I want to make it possible for the Department of Public Assistance of the State of West Virginia when the State of West Virginia funds are exhausted to be able to requisition wheat which may be exchanged for flour to feed those hungry miners. It is just that simple. It could apply to any other section of the country or to any other industry than the mining industry if the occasion arises. I can see no basic reason-

able argument against the plan to set up this reserve for future emergencies.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I would not be surprised if the gentleman from West Virginia would not be willing to pay the freight on it, too.

Mr. BAILEY. If the gentleman will note the last sentence of my amendment, I said the distribution and the servicing of it shall be on the same terms as the delivery to Pakistan. If we are going to pay the freight on the Pakistan shipments, then we will pay the freight into the mining area just the same as we would pay the transportation cost to Pakistan. It is that simple. I can see no reason why there would be any justifiable argument against an arrangement of that kind. It looks like it is a good business proposition and foresight. I certainly hope that the committee will seriously consider the amendment and offer no objection to it.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 3 minutes and that those 3 minutes be allotted to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia was offered in good faith and in the belief that we do not have any provisions of law now which would permit the distribution of commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation to charitable institutions. There is a law now in existence which provides that under certain conditions all of our surplus commodities—not alone wheat but all of our surplus commodities—may be distributed to charitable organizations, such as school-lunch programs and nonprofit institutions. I believe that law will take care of the situation which the gentleman mentions to a better extent and a greater degree than his amendment would do.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. May I remind the gentleman from Kansas that when you contact the surplus commodities department of the Agriculture Department they want to know who is going to arrange to pay the freight on it. That is the way you get your help. I do not want to make the miners of West Virginia the subject of charity by asking them to pay the freight on wheat. We are not asking the Red Cross to pay it to Pakistan.

Mr. HOPE. Has the gentleman made a request of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. BAILEY. I have made inquiry and I have been so advised. I have been getting help for some of my school districts and some of my State institutions. But somebody has to pay the freight and the miners do not have any money

to pay it. If they had they would not be in the situation they are in at the present time. They would not be on relief. I still can see no objection to the amendment.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman understands that on the school-lunch programs the State pays the freight and I have little doubt but what the State of West Virginia would be glad to pay the freight on the commodities. There are no doubt commodities in the gentleman's State that could be used.

Mr. BAILEY. My State legislature has been in extra session and one of the things they did in that special session—their regular session adjourned in January—was to transfer an additional million dollars to the department of public assistance in order to help carry this proposition. Why should my State of West Virginia be asked to raid its treasury and make available for relief something for which the State is not responsible? The Federal Government through the enactment of the reciprocal trade agreement let the coal markets down by permitting the shipping in of this residual oil. That is where the blame lies for this situation. Why should we raid our treasury to make good on something that is directly chargeable to the Federal Government?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAILEY) there were—ayes 57, noes 69.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HOPE and Mr. BAILEY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 58, noes 91.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SUTTON moves to strike out all after the enacting clause.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, this is not any underhanded way to defeat the bill. It is a straightforward motion to strike out all after the enacting clause.

Much discussion about American ships, American bottoms, to carry the wheat to Pakistan, and so forth, has been indulged in this afternoon, but I think first of all it should be decided whether or not we are going to give this \$122 million worth of wheat with the transportation to Pakistan.

Before our Committee on Agriculture it was brought out that 30 percent of this was to go to charity and 70 percent was to be sold, the money to be derived from that sale to go to the Government of Pakistan. So the talk of charity and famine is out of the question as far as I am concerned because only 30 percent of it will go for that.

To me, charity begins at home. You do not have to walk two blocks from this Nation's Capitol to find people that are starving right now.

As far as the famine in Pakistan is concerned, last year they had a famine

also. We did not give them any wheat; we lent them \$15 million. They got by all right on \$15 million. This year under the Mutual Security Act we gave them \$27,500,000, which is more than they had last year, when they did not starve. Now we come along and want to give them \$122 million.

To me, it is asinine, in the words of a former President of the United States. Our national debt is \$265 billion. Are we going to give the country completely away?

They say because we have a surplus of wheat we should do something with it. In the last few years we have been blessed with a bountiful crop of wheat, that is true, but we do not know how soon we may have another drought and need the wheat we have now. We do not know how soon the Secretary of Agriculture may impose agricultural allotments and quotas, and as a result we will not have the crop we have today.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, I for one want to go on record as not giving the United States away.

Let me say also, since it has been brought up that Pakistan is such a good ally of ours and that we need them in the United Nations, that the other day before the Committee on Agriculture when Governor Stassen mentioned the fact that they were such swell allies of ours and doing so much to help us and the United Nations, I ask him how many of their troops were in Korea helping the American boys. He said not one. If they are such great allies, why are they not over in Korea helping our boys? Why are they not over in Korea helping the United Nations?

As far as I am concerned, if they need this wheat, let us do as we did with India, let us lend it to them, because they say they need only 30 percent to give away. If you want it to go to charity, give them 30 percent of this. If you want to keep the Pakistan Government up, you can do that, but I for one am not in favor of doing it.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this motion will be agreed to, that we will strike out all after the enacting clause, because I am sincere in hoping that this Congress will get back to normalcy and get back to the American way of life and quit giving the American taxpayers' money away.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think this subject has been pretty well covered. I want to point out, however, that this is not merely an effort to give away some wheat. It is a part of our foreign policy, and if that policy means anything at all, it means strengthening our allies and building them up so that they will be strong and able to be of assistance to us, if we need them. All of the evidence which was before the committee was to the effect that Pakistan is today facing food shortages and starvation. Wheat constitutes almost two-thirds of the normal diet of the people of Pakistan. This year they are in the second year of famine, and their crop is only about two-thirds of the amount that is necessary to sustain their population. The people of Pakistan were able last year in the

face of a serious drought that confronted them, to secure some wheat from other nations. We loaned then \$15 million for that purpose. Furthermore, their wheat deficit was not as great at that time as it is this year. But this year they are confronted with the situation where they do not have the foreign exchange in dollars or sterling to purchase wheat. They do not have the necessary shipping with which to transport it. They have asked us in a dignified way to make available to them certain amounts of wheat and it has been the decision of our President and the Department of State after careful investigation that we should meet that request made to us by a friendly nation; an ally. That is all that is involved here today. It is a matter of giving away a surplus which we have in this country, to a country which needs it. I do not know of any better way to use our surpluses than to give them to people who are hungry. I can think of nothing that will bring down upon us the condemnation of the world to a greater extent than to have food spoiling in this country while people are going hungry in other parts of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON]

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BONNER: On page 2, line 6, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "Provided, however, That the wheat herein given Pakistan on reaching that country shall be processed or packed in 5 or 10 pound containers clearly marked 'Gift of the U. S. A.' and distributed to the needy citizens of Pakistan through a Pakistan agency approved by the American Ambassador."

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is clear and understandable to all. It has been my opportunity to go with certain committees visiting European countries whom we have been aiding. I was terribly disappointed and surprised to see charitable gifts sent by this Government with no marking and no understanding that this Government was giving the aid. The point here is to let the rank and file of the people know that the American Government and the American people are interested in them, interested in their plight, interested in their suffering, and desire to do something about it. Heretofore, many of our gifts of this kind have been received by countries, processed by them and sold to the people. I believe this amendment puts the spark in the bill and takes it to the very point that has been discussed so often and so much here today; giving it to hungry people, giving it to needy people, and seeing that it gets to the people without cost and without profit to some intermediary.

I cannot understand why in any way that would be embarrassing to the Pakistan Government; why in any way we, as American people, would not have the right to send that message to the Pak-

istan people, that we are doing this for needy people; that we recognize that we should do it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I am sure the gentleman realizes that all of this wheat certainly will not go to needy people. It is contemplated that only a small part of it will go to needy people. The rest of it will be sold.

Mr. BONNER. The entire debate, I will say, has been along the line that the reason for this bill is that people are starving, people are hungry, and need this. Does the gentleman mean to tell me that we are going to carry out the same policy of sending something to a nation, letting the nation sell it to processors, and letting the processors sell it to the people whom we have been talking about?

Mr. COOLEY. That is exactly what I am saying; and, if the gentleman will look on page 3 of the bill, he will see exactly what I am talking about. On line 6 we did strengthen that provision.

Mr. BONNER. Then I will say to the gentleman, have the provision apply to that part of the wheat that they are going to give away.

Mr. COOLEY. Very well; I see the thought the gentleman has in mind, but I would like to call his attention to the language in the bill which says, "to give full and continuous publicity in Pakistan to the assistance furnished by the people of the United States."

There the thought is to differentiate between the people and the Government of the United States.

Mr. BONNER. The intent is splendid, but when I receive a Christmas present I usually receive a little note with it from my friend who sent it, and I appreciate it so much more than I would to just receive a package from some person and not know from whom it was sent.

Mr. COOLEY. Some member of the committee wanted to strike out that provision because he thought we should not be bragging about this.

Mr. BONNER. We are not bragging about this one iota. I do not want to do anything to hurt this bill. I am interested in seeing some of our surplus go to the people who need it.

Mr. COOLEY. If we are not going to let the people of Pakistan know the donor's name, we might as well put a picture of Santa Claus on it and send this over to them.

Mr. BONNER. In the bill you have the language, but the person receiving it will not know that this is a gracious gift from the people who are interested in them.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman must realize that this would involve a substantial cost.

Mr. BONNER. If they give this wheat to the people in Pakistan, they have got to put it in some sort of container. They cannot give a person 10 pounds of grain in his hand. It has got to be put in a bag or a box or in something else.

I just think that this will appeal to the membership of this House, but if it does not, that is perfectly all right. But

I think it is only fair and proper to let the peoples of the world know that we are doing this, that we are sorry for their plight. We are not bragging about it at all, but we have this gracious gift to give them and we want to see that it gets to the people who need it.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I would like to support the gentleman's amendment. I think it is sound. I was on his committee when we found many instances where people did not know from whom these things came. I think if the gentleman would strike out the language concerning 5 and 10 pounds, and let them package it in whatever size containers they please, I should go along with the amendment.

Mr. BONNER. I will agree to any sound amendment to my proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment by striking out the words "five or ten pounds" and changing it to read:

In such package or container as may be deemed advisable by the agency distributing the wheat.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the gentleman's amendment if it is in some form so we can understand it, but I object to it in the present form.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want first of all to say that while the idea has a great deal of merit behind it, it is impractical. A great deal of this wheat will become a storage problem. I think it should be recognized that of the 1 million tons, 30 percent, or 300,000 tons, are to be placed in storage over there as a sort of backlog for future needs, and it will be necessary to store it for a period varying from several days to several months in storage facilities. The committee went into that very thoroughly. It will need to be stored in bulk over there.

The people of Pakistan use whole wheat; they do not buy it ground as we do here; they use it whole; they take it directly into their homes where it is cracked or crushed. They use whole wheat and little else, and it is distributed through village centers. The committee had every assurance that this wheat would be properly labeled and the information as to its source would be properly relayed to the people. Let me interject right here that in Pakistan a great deal of it will have to be done by word of mouth; but the donor will be properly identified, we will be given proper credit.

Much as I am in favor of the idea I feel that it is impractical and I think the committee should reject the proposal.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. The gentleman will admit that when he was on the com-

mittee with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] and myself, we did find many instances where the people did not know that the United States had anything to do with the aid they were getting. The gentleman will recall that.

Mr. HARVEY. I agree with the gentleman. That was in Europe. It is my belief—I have not visited in Pakistan, but I was in the Far East last fall—that the condition he complains of in Europe will not prevail in Pakistan.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield further, I feel that while we may not need to be as careful in Pakistan as we may have had to be with UNICEF in Poland or Czechoslovakia or Yugoslavia—and we did send aid there, and the Communist governments sort of misrepresented and the people thought they were getting it from their Communist overlords in some instances, but I do not think it would do any harm if there were some way to get our message across by the printed word on a container. It would not hurt our international relations at all.

Mr. HARVEY. I may say to the gentleman and repeat what I said before, that I feel that there is no doubt that the United States should be given credit for their generosity. I believe, however, that the type of amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina will not achieve that purpose and will not only enormously complicate the task of our agencies over there working with the Pakistan Government, but will also increase the cost unnecessarily.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as one Member of the House who, along with many others, has been vitally interested in the farm program, I am somewhat disturbed at the course followed here. I am afraid of starting off with what might appear to be a gift of a considerable amount of wheat, the production of which has had Government price support, because I do not want this type of action to become a part of any long-range farm program; to overproduce and give away what you produce. I believe firm price supports of basic commodities is highly essential under present conditions, but I also know we cannot maintain such supports unless we restrain ourselves from overproduction. However, it is not intended here to underwrite overproduction. I have therefore concluded that we should support this measure. If we are to help the people of this country who are now in distress, I think the proposal offered by the gentleman from North Carolina should be adopted so the people we are to help will know we did help them.

I would like to point out why, in my opinion, we should go along with the bill as written with this amendment. In the first place, during World War II, and for a time afterward, most of us in this House went along with a foreign-aid program because we felt it was absolutely essential, though even then, in many respects, I thought we were not handling the problem in the best way. I supported the Turkish-Greek loan. After that many of us came to the conclusion that we had not handled this pro-

gram in the right way and have opposed such programs since. Last week, once again a majority of this House provided for another year of foreign economic aid.

In that program, I have believed we should not have provided money. I have thought that we should help foreign countries in a way that we could afford, which heretofore we have not done. In this bill we do what we can afford, for this wheat is surplus to our needs. Why do we have it? The American farmers were asked to produce it for national defense. Our farmers are the only segment of our economy that we have asked to produce far beyond normal needs for the security of this country. With farmers there was no firm contract to take what they produced and no assurance that they were going to get even cost of production, but there has been a support price of 90 percent of the comparative purchasing power they had in 1909-14. Answering the call of our country the farmers have produced far beyond what we normally use. That is the reason we have these surpluses. However, even here, on all farm commodities our national investment is only a few billions of dollars as compared with \$129 billion of expenditures for military preparedness.

Now, having these surpluses, this is one way that we can afford to help foreign countries.

Another mistake, as I see it, in our foreign-aid program has been this: When we went beyond the gift of things that we have in abundance, we should have helped by an extension of credit to rehabilitate such country through the Export-Import Bank where, as we extended that credit, we could have controlled the use of our money toward really rehabilitating those countries instead of granting funds many times to be spent as they wished.

Instead of extending such credit, too frequently we have been giving them the money and in many instances since World War II those countries have used our money to buy from us things which were in short supply and which did very little to rehabilitate those countries. In this instance we are doing what we can well afford to do. We have the wheat and we do not need it. Again, the reason we have it is because we have gotten our farmers to produce beyond our needs in the name of national security without any firm contract or any assurance of cost of production.

I opposed the economic aid provisions of the bill passed last week, however it was passed. We are committed to it. Now if we do pass this bill or similar measures of this kind, when the appropriation bill from the Appropriations Committee reaches the floor we should take such gifts into consideration and we should reduce the amount of money appropriated. Also, if we are going to furnish this wheat to Pakistan out of the charity of our hearts, out of a feeling of sympathy for these people, if we are going to do it for the peoples of other countries, certainly the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina is sound. Heretofore it has been a common and usual practice in

foreign-aid programs that the money has been used to purchase commodities which in turn have been sold by the local governments to the people for high prices in numerous instances without the people themselves knowing even where it came from and with a feeling on the part of many people who did know that the American Government, the United States of America, was making a financial profit out of it and that there was really no charity involved in it. There is one way and one way only to let the people know, and that is to mark it clearly on the package "gift."

I think the gentleman's amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. Does the gentleman have any estimate of what the probable cost would be to package this wheat in 5- or 10-pound packages?

Mr. WHITTEN. I understand an amendment will be offered to change that provision on type of packages. However, having passed last week an authorization for approximately \$5 billion in foreign aid, against my vote I may say, and now that you are providing that this wheat shall be hauled in American ships at much higher costs, and in view of the huge foreign-aid program that we have heretofore indulged in, while I have the highest regard for the gentleman from Indiana, if the cost of a penny postcard in a sign on the package will give to the American people proper credit, it ill behooves anyone to raise a question at this time as to what such minor cost will be.

Mr. HARVEY. I think the gentleman will find it will cost at least \$20 million to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may modify my amendment and that the Clerk read it as modified.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BONNER: On page 2, line 6, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "Provided, however, That the wheat herein given Pakistan, whenever distributed on reaching that country, shall be processed or packed in containers clearly marked 'Gift of the U. S. A.' and distributed to needy citizens of Pakistan through a Pakistan agency approved by the American Ambassador."

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the good old give-away merry-go-round is about to go into operation again this afternoon.

Yesterday the distinguished majority floor leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] took the floor to make an appeal for the passage of this legislation.

When the wheat for India bill was before the House on May 23, 1951, the gen-

tleman from Indiana also spoke on that measure—page 5761 of the RECORD—and I should like to quote briefly from his remarks at that time, as follows:

We want to help people who need food, but we must recognize that America is not a bottomless barrel to be tapped by everybody at any time or for any sort of purpose that might strike somebody's fancy. We must recognize, as I see it, that as we go along helping other people we ought to try to get them to help us as much as they can, whether it is fighting in Korea or getting the materials we need here at home to maintain ourselves, making it possible for us to go on trying to be a potential force in the world to help free peoples who look to us for guidance and support.

I laud the gentleman; I did 2 years ago, for that statement. I laud him for that statement today.

How has India voted in the United Nations? I should like to have a compilation of the number of votes that have cast against the United States in the United Nations in the last 2 years. What is the United Nations doing to provide wheat for this famine stricken area, if it is a famine stricken area, and how many troops—the question raised by the gentleman from Tennessee—has Pakistan or India provided for the war in Korea?

Here is a publication from the United Nations giving the percentage of contributions by nations in the United Nations of combat troops, and your bifocals are better than mine if you find India or Pakistan having contributed a single combat soldier to Korea.

Now then, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], yesterday, raised a plaintive cry about the financial condition of Pakistan. Here is a copy of Pakistan Affairs, published by the Pakistan Embassy in Washington. I assume every Member of the House got one of them. I saved mine. It is dated April 1, 1953, and is headed "Pakistan's Sixth Surplus Budget."

The article says in part:

The honorable Mr. Mohamad Ali, Pakistan's Finance Minister, presented his country's sixth surplus budget to Parliament in Karachi on March 14, 1953.

Here is another copy of Pakistan Affairs, dated April 15, 1953, and headed "Pakistan's Five Astonishing Years." In this article the New York Times comments on the excellent financial situation of Pakistan. Is anyone bragging about the fine financial situation of the United States?

Now then, I would like to call your attention to something else. I call your attention to a report a few days ago by Attorney General Brownell who said that in 1951 a gentleman by the name of Dean Acheson, or rather, his law firm—I want to correct that—his law firm in Washington collected nearly \$127,000 for legal fees for representing the Pakistan Government in Washington. I wonder, Mr. JUDD, how the Acheson law firm in Washington was paid in 1951, the same year we were giving India \$190 million worth of wheat. I wonder if the Acheson law firm was paid in Indian rupees, or dollars. I did not discover any rupees in circulation in Washington in 1951.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, is the gentleman talking about India or Pakistan?

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about Pakistan.

Mr. JUDD. We did not give any wheat to Pakistan in 1951.

Mr. GROSS. No; but you say that Pakistan cannot pay us either for the wheat or transportation as proposed here.

Mr. JUDD. I would like to follow through on the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. GROSS. You are going to give Pakistan some wheat here and you say they have nothing to pay for it.

Mr. JUDD. Let us talk about what the gentleman said about me, and about Mr. Acheson getting some money from Pakistan. The gentleman asked, What were they paying in return for the wheat we sent them?

Mr. GROSS. You said Pakistan cannot afford to pay.

Mr. JUDD. Is the gentleman sure he is talking about Pakistan or India? I want to make sure about that.

Mr. GROSS. I stated that the Acheson law firm represented Pakistan in 1951, and for that representation drew \$127,000.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman also said that we sent them \$190 million in 1951, which is not the case. In 1951 the Pakistan Government had some foreign exchange. They were selling jute and they were selling cotton. As the gentleman knows, the world price of those commodities has dropped 60 percent.

Mr. GROSS. And they are still selling it.

Mr. JUDD. No; they exhausted their foreign exchange, as I tried to point out yesterday, in importing 800,000 tons of wheat last year. They did not ask for any foreign aid or loans or anything else as long as they had reserves. They do not have any reserves now.

Mr. GROSS. In 1952 they paid the Acheson law firm nearly \$68,000.

Mr. JUDD. I do not know about that, but they imported 800,000 tons of wheat last year and paid for it.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; and they allegedly had a famine in Pakistan last year. If they could find the funds to pay the Acheson law firm, they have money. Let them buy this wheat.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], but before I talk about that I would like to ask my good friend from Iowa not to be too hard on the majority leader. I like the majority leader, and he is trying to do his job. He is working under difficulties. I heard someone here today say that last fall the President said he was in favor of things like TVA, that they had done great good for the country. Last week he said it is creeping socialism. The thing you have to know is, What does he think about it today? The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] is under that difficulty, too. He is trying to follow the gyrations down there, and he is working under difficulties. I give

him credit. He is trying to do his job.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman had followed my statement he should know I was not being hard on the gentleman from Indiana. I lauded his statement.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. The gentleman is sympathetic with him like I am, I think.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Is the gentleman in favor of the bill?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I am in favor of the bill and I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina. I would like to elaborate on that and get a little bit serious.

I happen to be on a committee of which the gentleman from North Carolina was chairman in 1949, and believe it or not, in 1949 we were giving aid to such nations as Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia in the form of assistance to the United Nations Children's Emergency Fund. This committee was able to get behind the Iron Curtain and take a look at some of those operations. In some of these countries they were giving these children milk, all right, but they were convincing them through propaganda that they would not have gotten the milk if it had not been for the Communist government in that country; that the great glory of the Communist government was that they were able to procure milk for them. They did not tell them where it came from.

I visited a schoolroom in one of those countries in which the kids got up when they got their milk and sang a little song in which they praised the Communist leader of that country for providing the milk for them. I made some remarks about that the next year and I was criticized for being against hungry children. I am not against hungry children. I am not against giving this wheat to Pakistan. I think we ought to give it to them. I do not think we ought to pat ourselves on the back too much when we do it and talk about how charitable we are.

When you get right down to it, it is either give it to them or let the weevils eat it up. Right in Kansas now, or the States just south of Kansas, they are storing wheat on the ground in the open. How long is that wheat going to be usable? I am in favor of giving it to them. Certainly no nation could justify letting wheat lie out in the weather, in the storms, the sun, and the rain, and spoil, while people were going hungry. But let us not get too self-righteous about it.

I think the gentleman's amendment makes sense, because if we are going to create good will for the United States we are not going to do it with some government that may be changed tomorrow, we are not going to do it with the leaders of the country; where you breed good will is when you get the good will of the people of the country, the average man and woman. I want to say further in answer to the argument that it is going to cost too much that this wheat is going to have to be packaged. As the gentleman said, they can-

not come and get it in their two hands. I do not know if they will put it in paper bags, cotton bags, jute bags, barrels, or what, but whatever the put it in, it is going to cost a very negligible amount of money to stamp on those containers "This is given through the generosity of the people of the United States" or words of similar import. I think it will do more for international relations with a program like that than you would with a lot of programs that we have voted on. I might say a little facetiously, it will do a lot for weevil control by getting this wheat out of the country so that the weevils will not have a place to live and eat.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HARVEY. I just would like to say I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina, in its present form, is a great improvement over the original amendment. I think the objections which I voiced to it in its original form largely have been eliminated as it is presently constituted.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I made the suggestion that we change it so that it would be acceptable to the House.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment for three main reasons. First, it would be totally impracticable and would make almost impossible the effective distribution of this grain. Second, it would greatly increase the cost. Third, it is not necessary as a means of making sure the people of Pakistan know where this wheat comes from. Let us look at the first reason. How is this grain to be distributed? Why, it is put right into the rationing system in Pakistan. They have a very tight rationing system, trying to stretch out such wheat as they have in order to make sure it is equitably distributed, especially to the people who are in direct need. Besides, if this amendment in its amended form were to pass, it would cost more money, not less, than in the original form because apparently the wheat would have to be put up in 1-, 2-, or 3-pound packages.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. Not at the moment.

Mr. Chairman, the Library of Congress yesterday estimated that if this wheat were to be packaged in 100-pound bags, it would cost \$7 million more dollars. If we insist it be put up in 1-pound or 2-pound or 5- or 10-pound packages, how much more would that cost? We would have to get the Library of Congress to find out how many additional millions of dollars that would amount to.

Again, consider the additional cost in manpower which it would involve. It would require the setting up of a whole bureaucracy of people to handle all this complicated system of packages. How would they do it? Would each person have to have two rationing cards—one to get one third of his wheat in the packages which come from us, and another to get the two-thirds of his wheat which comes from their own supplies?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I must decline to yield until I finish my statement, and then I shall be glad to answer the gentleman's question if I can. The gentleman had 5 minutes, and I think that is as much time as I am supposed to have.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would not only greatly increase the cost; it would greatly increase the difficulty of distribution. It would be an almost impossible extra burden for a country which is already in difficulty because of an inadequacy of trained civil servants. This Pakistan Government is only 6 years old for the sixth largest population in the world. Think what it would involve to find and employ enough qualified people to take on the job of handling all these packages outside the rationing system.

The way it will be handled under the committee bill is that the wheat is landed at Karachi and sent in freight cars to larger centers, then transported in trucks or animal-drawn carts to the smaller centers where their own grain supply is being rationed out to the people. These freight cars and trucks or other vehicles, whatever they are, will be labelled—or so it was done in India. The wheat distributed out to the villages in wheelbarrows or on the back of donkeys or buffaloes, is also marked. It provides in the bill that they first have to enter into an agreement with our Government that they will give full and continuous publicity to the assistance furnished by us, and that our people can observe without restriction, the distribution of this wheat in Pakistan. Actually this amendment, while it sounds all right, and while the purpose is completely laudable, will be recognized as totally impracticable of operation, if you examine it for a moment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield just so that I may point out that if the wheat were put up in 5-pound packages, it would amount to 400 million bags? That is what we are talking about.

Mr. JUDD. May I in passing mention another point of confusion. It has been stated here that the wheat all goes to needy people. Then somebody has objected it does not all go to poor people. A distinction should be made between the word "needy" and the word "poor." It all goes to needy people. There is not enough grain to go around in Pakistan, so they all need grain. But a lot of people there—it is estimated 70 percent of them can pay for it in their own currency, if this wheat is available. They are needy in the sense that there is not enough wheat for them, but not poor in the sense that they do not have Pakistan currency with which they can pay under their own rationing system.

My third reason against the amendment is that it is not necessary in order to have the source of the aid known. It has been said that the people in some of the European countries, both Western Europe and the Communist countries in Eastern Europe, did not know that aid

we furnished them came from us. That is unquestionably true. I hold no brief for it and such a result was inexcusable. But Pakistan's situation is very different; it is not like some of the countries in Western Europe which have been "top dogs" so long that it is understandably difficult for them to have to admit to their people that they are compelled to get vast assistance from the United States of America. That is a matter of their pride, which "goeth before a fall" and lives on long after it.

The eastern European countries are Communist dominated. Naturally these satellite governments did not want to have their people know that their grain or other aid they received was coming from capitalistic, or even free, United States of America.

These provisions might have been justified in dealing with those countries. But Pakistan is a country that is eager to let every one of its people know by our deeds that it is an ally of the United States and that the United States is standing behind it. It gains strength thereby. It does not lose prestige or standing with its people by being associated with the United States of America. I assure you that people in Asian countries, even though without our means of communication, soon know by word of mouth what is going on, even better than our people sometimes do.

We do not have to try to buy the goodwill of these people. We have their goodwill. Let us not be so foolish as to go in with a proposition that would increase their burdens and jeopardize the great goodwill and friendship toward our country that we now have at the top, in the middle, and all the way down to the poorest and neediest people in Pakistan.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if I understood the gentleman's amendment when it was read, it would require that all wheat be distributed free of charge. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. BONNER. If the gentleman is yielding to me, no; that portion of what we are sending to the needy people be so handled in this way. And since the gentleman has yielded to me, I want to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], since he raised this point, that the amendment now reads that the size of the packages can be decided upon after the wheat gets there. Certainly it is reasonable to believe that we ought to sign our name to this generous gift in some way, so that the public will know something about it.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to know if actually all this wheat is not a gift insofar as the United States of America is concerned; whether the country which gets the wheat in turn gives it to the people is another story. But to put it all in containers labeled "Gift of the

American people" would be factually honest, would it not?

Mr. HOPE. I am just trying to get an interpretation of the amendment so we will understand what its purpose is. The point I was going to make is if it is contended that all of this has to be given to the people and none of it can be sold that would utterly destroy the program of using the funds for which this wheat is sold to build up the agriculture of Pakistan so this calamity will not occur again. That was my purpose in asking the gentleman whether it was intended that all of this wheat should be given away, because I can think of no greater perversion of what is intended here than to say that all of this wheat must be given away.

Mr. BONNER. My intent is only to apply this amendment to that portion that will be given in charity and the balance of it that is to be given to improve the economic condition of the country they can do with as they please.

But all of the debate here has been with respect to the needy people, the hungry people, that portion of the wheat that you are going to give to the needy and the hungry people and the people in distress, which should be given to them in this way, I think. Otherwise, let us hide our charity.

Mr. HOPE. In view of what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has said—and I think there is a great deal in what he has said—why does the gentleman want to differentiate between that which is distributed free of charge and that for which the people pay, because, after all, they both should know where it comes from, should they not?

Mr. BONNER. I certainly do not want them to sell that portion which we intend shall go to charity, to the needy people.

Mr. HOPE. We are sending it to them to make it available to save those people from starvation.

Mr. BONNER. Somebody is going to make a profit on it.

Mr. HOPE. No; no one is going to make a profit on it.

Mr. BONNER. How does the gentleman know?

Mr. HOPE. It is going to be sold by the Pakistan Government at the same rate that they sell the wheat that they produce in Pakistan. It is going to be rationed in exactly the same way as they ration their own wheat. It will be distributed through their ration boards and their village councils. The money goes into the counterpart fund which is used to build up the agriculture of Pakistan.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. I have great respect for the gentleman from Kansas and I assure him that there is no desire on my part to confuse the bill. I am for the bill; I am going to vote for it with or without the amendment, but I do hope that the amendment in regard to that portion of the wheat that we are going to give away will be agreed to.

Mr. HOPE. Notwithstanding what the gentleman says, and I know he has no desire to confuse the bill, his amendment does have that effect.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Does the gentleman recall that we had evidence before our committee about the distribution system that would show that such a proposal as this would not be practical at all?

Mr. HOPE. All the evidence we have had I think indicates that it would not be practical.

Mr. ALBERT. That is my understanding. If a man came with a wheelbarrow of his own and backed up to the warehouse for some of this wheat would they have to stop and package it and stamp it before they could deliver it to him?

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman is exactly correct.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me remind the gentleman from Kansas that in speaking against my amendment some minutes ago the gentleman referred to Section 416 of the Agriculture Act and said that it provided for the payment of transportation costs. Now, that does not apply to wheat; it applies to perishable. Of course, wheat will deteriorate, but it is not generally considered a perishable article. I think in all fairness, since the evident impression is created that it provided for the payment of transportation costs on such things as wheat that the gentleman from Kansas should in an extension of remarks set out section 416 in the Record so there will remain no doubt as to what the law actually does provide.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will not trespass too long on your patience, but I do want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the bill itself contains provisions which I think are adequate with regard to publicity. I, of course, agree with the sentiment expressed by my friend from North Carolina. I assume all of us are anxious for the recipients to know the name of the donor of this great gift, to wit, the American people.

In the committee an amendment was offered to line 7, so amending it as to include the word "people," to make the provision read:

To give full and continuous publicity in Pakistan to the assistance furnished by the people of the United States.

In the very next paragraph, line 8, section (c) there is the provision:

To permit persons designated by the Government of the United States to observe without restriction the distribution in Pakistan of supplies made available under authority of this act.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. In just a moment.

Then going back to the beginning of section 23 I call attention to the fact that the agreement contemplated by this act will be entered into "by the President of the United States on the part of the people of the United States"; and in that agreement he will make provision

for necessary publicity and necessary supervision. It seems to me it would be rather cumbersome to require the Government of Pakistan to package this wheat in packages of any size or quantity.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. And does not the gentleman remember that we were given assurances by Governor Stassen and Secretary Dulles both that that provision would be carried out?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman will recall that when we had UNRRA we were given all kinds of assurances that the generosity of the American people would be credited for our efforts to help unfortunate people. Notwithstanding the fact that we poured billions of dollars into UNRRA, every country on the globe got credit for distribution of foodstuffs and other materials to the poverty-stricken of the war-torn countries of the world except the United States. Now, we should in some way—and that is the argument I brought up here when we first started the debate—insure that America should be credited as the donor of this wheat to the people of Pakistan. I asked how the wheat was to be distributed to the people, the poverty-stricken, hungry people of Pakistan, so we could be certain that they get the wheat to the people for whom it is intended. I think that the gentleman's amendment is right, because UNRRA of several years ago should be an experience to us of maladministration of our materials to war-torn countries of the world.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree that the objective of the gentleman's amendment is grand and laudable; but you told the people last November you were going to bring about a change. Are you not willing to leave this up to the President in the White House and the people who will help him administer the law?

Mr. GAVIN. I want it specifically written into the bill as to how it is going to be distributed and who is going to get it.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman think that President Eisenhower will carry out this proposal in a proper manner?

Mr. GAVIN. Certainly I have every confidence in the President. I am for the bill and I shall vote for the bill and I want the record to show that we want this wheat to reach the hungry people of Pakistan.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. My estimate would be from the best information I can find that probably not 1 out of 20 of the poor people, the ones who cannot pay at all, can read at all; therefore we would be doing under this amendment a very beautiful job of fancy packaging and

printing for people who could not read the label on the package. It seems to me that there must be other means of letting those people who cannot read know about our American generosity rather than through the package system which might work fine in an American community but will not work at all where most of the people cannot read at all.

Mr. GAVIN. Certainly I think the people will be intelligent enough to understand that this wheat is coming from Uncle Sam if it is properly packaged and explained to them.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BONNER) there were—ayes 52, noes 108.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON:

Page 1, line 8, strike out the words "upon such terms and conditions as the President determines appropriate", and insert these same words "upon such terms and conditions as the President determines appropriate" at the end of line 10 on page 1.

Page 2, line 4, strike out the period and add the following: "on credit terms as the President may determine, including payment by transfer to the United States (under such terms and in such quantities as may be agreed to between the President and the Government of Pakistan) of materials required by the United States as a result of deficiencies, actual or potential, in its own resources, for the purpose that as far as the President shall determine practicable and possible there shall be obtained for the United States the immediate and continuing transfer of substantial quantities of such materials, particularly those found to be strategic and critical."

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I make the point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would have to inform the gentleman that this is not an appropriation bill, and in the opinion of the Chair the amendment is in order.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is for the purpose of conforming our foreign policy in respect to Pakistan to the existing United States policy in respect to India. Under the bill, aid is provided for 700,000 long tons for emergency famine relief. Of course that should be given to Pakistan by grant. But under the bill there is a working reserve to be set up in Pakistan of 300,000 long tons which should be sold on credit. My amendment puts that amount on credit just as the bill to India did and as the present act to India now provides. Unless we have reason for distinguishing between this

aid to Pakistan and the Indian aid, we will in the future have to come in here and relieve India of \$190 million worth of credit that has been given to them on the same basis. So that unless this amendment is passed it will be a cost to the United States taxpayers later on the India bill of \$190 million.

If we cannot come up with a foreign aid bill that fits in with previous policy in an area, then we must make the present foreign policy as represents the other country, for example, India, conform. There is no doubt that Pakistan, for 6 years, has balanced its budget and has a surplus, which is more than this Government has been able to accomplish. There is no doubt, likewise, if Pakistan cannot pay in cash, under my amendment she can pay in materials, and preferably strategic materials, if she has any. In the India aid act you will find this same provision at the very beginning, that India is permitted to pay in materials and resources to make up our United States deficiencies, actual or potential.

To me, Pakistan should do the buying on credit for any amount that is not outright relief for famine aid but is simply to be put in their own granaries and in their own treasury as an operating fund to operate as a reserve in the future. On the 300,000 tons for reserve, my amendment states that the President in his discretion shall sell it to Pakistan under credit terms with the right to pay either in money or, as the President shall determine, in materials, and preferably in strategic materials.

In addition, if this amendment passes, I would have another amendment at the end of the bill, just as we had it for India, which is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: Page 4, after line 7, insert:

"Sec. 4. (a) Any sums payable by the Government of Pakistan under the terms agreed to between the Government of the United States and the Government of Pakistan on or before January 1, 1959, as interest or principal of any debt incurred under this act, and not to exceed a total of \$5 million, shall, when paid, be placed in a special deposit account in the Treasury of the United States, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, to remain available until expended. This account shall be available to the Department of State for the following uses:

"(1) Studies, instruction, technical training, and other educational activities in the United States and in its Territories or possessions (A) for students, professors, other academic persons, and technicians who are citizens of Pakistan, and (B) with the approval of appropriate agencies, institutions, or organizations in Pakistan, for students, professors, other academic persons, and technicians who are citizens of the United States to participate in similar activities in Pakistan, including in both cases travel expenses, tuition, subsistence, and other allowances and expenses incident to such activities; and

"(2) The selection, purchase, and shipment of (A) American scientific, technical, and scholarly books and books of American literature for higher educational and research institutions of Pakistan; (B) American laboratory and technical equipment for higher education and research in Pakistan; and (C) the interchange of similar materials and equipment from Pakistan for higher education and research in the United States.

"(b) Funds made available in accordance with the provisions stated above may be used

to defray costs of administering the program authorized herein.

"(c) Disbursements from the special deposit account shall be made by the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury Department, upon vouchers duly certified by the Secretary of State or by authorized certifying officers of the Department of State."

Renumber remaining sections accordingly.

This amendment states that \$5 million worth of the Pakistan payments to the United States shall be used for student exchange, technical assistance, and scientific and technical books of that type. Then we would have a bill that would include a grant for famine aid of 700,000 tons, which the President in his discretion may give to them as a grant. As to the 300,000 tons which are proposed for the working reserves within the country, they should be sold on long-term credits are over a period of years. Under my proposal, we are not making paupers out of these people, we are letting them stand on their own feet. In addition, you are conforming this Pakistan bill specifically to the India aid bill. I believe this is necessary in order to save the \$190 million that will have to be given back to India otherwise.

Secondly, in this particular area, every country within the area should be treated alike. I cannot see the reason why, if we treat India one way, we do not treat Pakistan the same way. Many have complained of certain actions by India, but for example, all actions of Pakistan are not just to the good. May I ask this committee, has this committee checked on the number of Pakistan ships that have been trading with Communist China? To my information, Pakistan has sent 21 shiploads of material to Communist China within the past year or so.

Under those circumstances, I believe you need some portion of this wheat to be sent on credit, so that the Pakistan Government will have some responsibilities too. I believe we still need some hold on them more than simply an outright gift. Just as I said on Yugoslavia earlier, let us keep a little hold on some of these things we are doing. Let us provide the aid, but let us have it conform to the foreign policy right straight through, and that is the American foreign policy for the security of this country.

It is surprising to me to find myself voting so much among the conservatives of this Congress the past weeks of this session, but a complete give-away program is too much for me to take in the interests of the hard pressed American taxpayer. In all justice, where these foreign countries are able to pay, they should pay for assistance, rather than throwing the entire burden on our United States taxpayers. Our obligation as Congressmen in this session is to balance the budget, and start to reduce taxes as we promised, and I fully intend to make my word good, and fulfill such campaign promises in honesty and good faith.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Pennsylvania. Unless I am misinformed

by him, and I have no reason to judge that on the basis of past and present experience, his amendment merely makes Pakistan and India operate under the same formula. Is that correct?

Mr. FULTON. As to the aid which is not outright relief aid in Pakistan but is for their reserve requirements, that is, the 300,000 long tons, it puts India and Pakistan on the same basis. That is correct.

Mr. POWELL. I think this amendment therefore is elementary. I am sure there is no one that can object to it. It will, as pointed out by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, come back to haunt us when the aid-to-India bill comes up again.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McCORMACK. Knowing my distinguished friend's mind as I think I do and to some extent how we meet with one another so frequently mentally, may I say that I have always felt that we made a mistake in the case of India. Why should we make another mistake and put Pakistan in the same category? Why not bring India back to this level?

Mr. POWELL. If my distinguished minority whip can get the acceptance of the majority leader to the proposal, that when the India bill comes up we will apply to India the formula which is now written into this bill, I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] and I will agree. But we have seen too many agreements broached on this floor fail to come up at some future date.

I think we made a great mistake a few minutes ago when we did not adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina, not every container should be labeled "Gift of the U. S. A."

We have another amendment coming up from the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] that this grain be distributed by the American Red Cross and the Pakistan Red Cross. I am in favor of that.

We might as well make up our minds, especially those of us who have gone around the world in the past few months, that we are losing this fight. We are losing the fight despite the fact that we are spending billions of dollars, because we are just not selling the United States of America.

If this amendment, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not carried, we will gain friends in Pakistan and we will lose friends in India. The people of India will resent the fact that we have forced on them terms that we are not giving to the people of Pakistan, and rightfully so.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. It is my understanding when the request came from India, it was a request to purchase rather than a request for a grant.

Mr. POWELL. That was advisable. But do you mean we have to adapt our legislation according to requests. When we look at a country like Pakistan that

has a surplus and we have a debt of \$250 billion, I do not think we should blindly accept any request. They are in need of grain. That is paramount. They also have a surplus, or if not a surplus, then they are close to having a surplus, that is fact number two. Why not give dignity to Pakistan by putting them on their feet rather than making paupers and recipients of charity out of them. It would be better for their country if it were done that way. Let them purchase the grain as did India.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Pakistan has a budgetary surplus in rupees, but they cannot purchase foreign grain with that. India had currency and resources which were convertible into dollars. We did not force any terms on India. We gave her what she asked for. She asked for a loan. Our people in India said she would be able to service that loan. Pakistan said it could not handle a loan and asked for a grant. Our people out there examined the situation and said they could not service a loan for wheat without unduly jeopardizing their financial condition and their capacity to get credits for developing their food-growing capacity. So the two countries were treated differently because the two situations are quite different.

Mr. POWELL. The situations are not different. You will increase discord between these two States. The gentleman from Pennsylvania does not say in his amendment that Pakistan shall pay us back in dollars. He says they shall pay us back in whatever material that they have.

Mr. JUDD. I would like to know what materials they have.

Mr. POWELL. That does not matter. Whatever materials they do have can be used to pay us back. They must have some. How could they have a surplus in their economy and we a national debt?

Mr. JUDD. I would like to know what the materials are.

Mr. POWELL. Maybe they may have materials which we can use.

Mr. JUDD. India had a great many materials which we could use and needed. But Pakistan has nothing we need but raw jute. We do not want raw jute.

Mr. POWELL. Why not? We can trade raw jute on the world market, and get dollars with it.

Let us proceed.

Mr. Chairman, for years we have been told and every assurance has been given us, that what we wanted would be carried out, that the United States of America would receive full publicity as the giver and donor. I am tired of getting assurances on each bill which never become actualities when the bill becomes law. I think it is time we stopped looking for assurances and promises from the various administrators whether of my own party of the preceding administration, or of the Republican Party, the present administration. Let us write specifically into these bills that what we give is given in the name of the United States of America and so labeled. One Communist with a 50-cent paint brush

and a dollars worth of red paint can go through the streets of a village writing on the walls "peace and bread" and undo in one night the good of the billions of dollars that we vote here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I wonder if we could not come to some agreement on limiting debate on this amendment?

Mr. HOPE. What would the gentleman's suggestion be?

Mr. COOLEY. Suppose debate close in 5 minutes?

Mr. HOPE. Does the gentleman suggest that all debate close in 5 minutes?

Mr. COOLEY. That all debate close in 5 minutes on the amendment pending and all amendments thereto.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to that.

Mr. COOLEY. There are no requests for time and debate can be concluded immediately after the gentleman from Kansas finishes his statement.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, at the suggestion of the gentleman from North Carolina, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. I think it would be a great mistake to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. If you look at the bill, it does not say that any of this wheat is to be a grant. It does not say what the arrangement is going to be, but it has been explained in the committee hearings that it was expected the first 700,000 tons would be a grant. As to what the remainder would be, that was left open because we do not know what the situation will be at the time this 300,000 tons may be required. It is to go, if it goes at all—and it may not go at all—as a reserve. It is expected that the 700,000 tons will take care of the immediate situation. If at the end of this year it should appear that weather conditions in Pakistan are such that there may be another short wheat crop, or if estimates of production and consumption should turn out to be inaccurate, then it would be important to furnish these 300,000 tons. If those conditions exist then, in all probability, it would have to go as a grant, just as the 700,000 tons will go. But I believe the thing to do is to trust our President so that he can deal with the situation when it arises in the way that seems best as far as the foreign policy of this country is concerned.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. The former minority leader from Massachusetts had said that he favored—and he made the statement on the floor—giving India the same terms; that is, relieving India of the

\$190 million obligation that they now owe the United States Government for the wheat that had been given them in 1951.

May I ask the gentleman on the floor whether he likewise will sponsor the \$190 million grant to India, rather than a loan if my amendment does not pass, so that for that area, too, you will have the same foreign policy? Otherwise, unless you have the 300,000 tons working reserve, which Pakistan admittedly will not use now, unless you have that paid for on credit, just as India got it, we should have on the floor a statement that we will then give India back the \$190 million, because we certainly are not treating India as we are treating Pakistan.

Mr. HOPE. I am not prepared to say what the policy should be as far as India is concerned. As I recall it we gave them what they asked for at the time they made the request, and I assume they are still satisfied with the way that transaction was handled. I do not think we could make any greater mistake than to say that because we gave one country a grant that we have to treat every other country exactly like that, because we have to deal with the circumstances as they exist at any particular time.

As far as India is concerned, she is able to borrow from the International Bank. She has vast natural resources. She has minerals. She has cotton and manufactured jute and other commodities that she can export, if necessary. The situation with India and Pakistan is entirely different, because India can get dollars. But all the evidence is that Pakistan cannot get dollars. Pakistan is a poor country, without great natural resources, without great wealth. It is a different situation and we should treat it in a different way.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes 31, noes 91.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. For the purpose of making payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities disposed of hereunder, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are equal to the Corporation's investment in such commodities, including handling costs, plus the costs incurred in making deliveries hereunder. Any funds or other assets available to the Commodity Credit Corporation may be used, in advance of such appropriation or payments, for carrying out the purposes of this act.

Sec. 3. No assistance under authority of this act shall be made available until an agreement is entered into between Pakistan and the United States containing the following undertakings, and any others the President may determine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of this act, on the part of Pakistan:

(a) To distribute the supplies made available under this act, as well as similar supplies obtained locally or imported from outside sources by the Government of Pakistan, among the people of Pakistan without discrimination.

(b) To give full and continuous publicity in Pakistan to the assistance furnished by the United States.

(c) To permit persons designated by the Government of the United States to observe without restriction the distribution in Pakistan of supplies made available under authority of this act.

(d) To deposit in a special account amounts of the currency of Pakistan equivalent to the amounts of such currency accruing to the Government of Pakistan from the import and sale of commodities furnished as a grant hereunder, this account to be utilized as may be agreed upon by the United States and the Government of Pakistan for the benefit of the people of Pakistan in programs to increase food production and in other projects and programs in the mutual interest of the United States and Pakistan.

(e) To allocate to the use of the Government of the United States 5 percent of the local currency account established in subsection (d) for use, in accordance with applicable United States laws, for local currency requirements of the United States, including administrative and operating expenses in Pakistan in connection with assistance supplied by the United States.

(f) To pursue all appropriate measures to reduce its relief needs and to increase production and supply and improve distribution of foodstuffs within Pakistan so as to lessen the danger of similar emergencies in the future.

Sec. 4. All or any part of the assistance provided hereunder shall be terminated by the President whenever he, or Congress by concurrent resolution, determines that because of changed conditions continuation of assistance is unnecessary or undesirable. Termination of assistance to Pakistan under this section may include the termination of deliveries of all supplies scheduled under this act and not yet delivered.

Sec. 5. Nothing contained in this act shall affect the applicability of section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, or other provisions of law to the local currency allocated to the use of the United States in accordance with the agreement provided for in section 3.

Mr. HOPE (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as read and that it may be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 2, lines 8 and 12, and page 3, line 15, strike out the word "commodities", where it appears and substitute the word "wheat;" and further amend the bill on page 2, line 23; page 3, lines 3 and 10, and page 4, line 14, by striking the word "supplies", where it appears and substituting the word "wheat."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill to provide for the transfer of price support wheat to Pakistan, but it seems that when the Mutual Security Administration—they, I presume are the ones who fixed the bill up in the first place—when they got ready to draft the bill they reached into various drawers and pulled out the sections of the bill together, and they failed to refer to wheat. In section 2, line 8, we call it "commodities" and we call it "commodities" in line 12. Then

when we get down to line 23 we call it "supplies;" and on page 3 we call it "supplies—supplies" down to line 15 where it again becomes "commodities."

I think if we are going to deal in wheat we ought to deal in wheat.

Mr. HOPE. It means wheat in every case, does it not?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I do not know. Mr. Chairman, I am a little leery of the people in Mutual Security because in their appearance before our committee they would tell us some things when we asked for information but would leave other things unsaid, as came out on the floor today. I would rather be specific because wheat is all we are dealing in, or at least that is what I presume we are dealing in. If we do not say "wheat" it then leaves the bill open so they could come in at some time later and say that under section 2, page 2, we used the word "commodities" and it covers other different things.

Now, if it is wheat we are talking about let us make it wheat throughout.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. Perhaps they wanted to give a pound of butter with every package of wheat so they could buy some other commodities too.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think the amendment speaks for itself, Mr. Chairman.

I yield back the balance of my time and ask for the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to point out that the only part of the bill which makes provision for the transfer of any commodity is section 1, and the only authority is to transfer wheat; so very obviously the language does refer to wheat wherever it appears in the bill.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Can the gentleman tell me any objection to my amendment?

Mr. HOPE. There is this objection to it, if no other: If we adopt the amendment we would have to take the bill to conference, and I am hoping that we can pass the bill today and get this wheat on its way.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Have we got a bill so sacrosanct we cannot amend it?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any Canadian wheat in this bill? We have been importing a lot of Canadian wheat into this country. Is there any Canadian wheat in the bill? And if so ought we not to make some provision for giving the Canadians credit too?

Mr. HOPE. This is to be taken from the Commodity Credit price-support program stocks, and it is American wheat.

Mr. GROSS. What did we do with all the Canadian wheat we bought?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES of Missouri) there were—ayes 38, noes 75.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments in the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments:

Page 2, line 24, strike out the words "as well as similar supplies obtained locally or imported from outside sources by the Government of Pakistan."

Page 3, line 2, strike out the word "discrimination," and insert: "discrimination; and to provide such supplies free of cost to persons who, by virtue of circumstances beyond their control, are unable to pay for them."

Page 3, line 7, after the words "by the" insert: "people of the."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Dorn of South Carolina: On page 3, after line 5, insert: "(B) To request the American Red Cross, the Pakistan Red Cross, their agents or employees to aid, assist, and supervise the distribution to those unable to pay for the supplies made available under authority of this act; to further request the American Red Cross and the Pakistan Red Cross to aid in determining those unable to pay, in accordance with agreements entered into between these organizations, the President, and the Government of Pakistan."

Renumber the paragraphs that follow accordingly.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have become awfully alarmed in the past few years about the tendency on the part of this country, the Government of this country, to send the taxpayers' money and commodities to the governments of other countries to sell as they see fit, often finding their way into black market operations and much going to benefit world communism. It is injuring the prestige of the United States abroad. I believe that there is a way out of this situation.

I have offered an amendment to this bill, and I hope the members of this committee will consider it carefully, which simply states that the American Red Cross and the Red Cross of Pakistan shall be requested to aid and assist in the distribution of this grain and in determining who the people are who are unable to pay for this grain.

I conferred this morning with the president of the American Red Cross, Hon. Roland Harriman, at the Statler Hotel. He told me that they are trained and equipped to do this job and they would be delighted to do it, but that they could not indulge or conspire in any way in the sale of any grain. He said they would be pleased to offer their assistance, their advice and supervision in seeing that the people who actually need this grain get it.

I think the most marvelous job done in the field of foreign relief was done by the Herbert Hoover Commission following World War I with the advice, aid, and consent of the Red Cross. The Red Cross during World War II handled the expenditure of \$172 million in all sections of the world. It handled relief in

Spain in 1937. It did a marvelous job in Greece in 1940, and in the Moldavia Province of Rumania, along with General Scyler of the United States military mission in 1947, it did a fine job of distributing \$3½ million of relief to this drought area.

Now I want to say this, that I have visited in Pakistan; I have been to Karachi and to India. I think we are going to lose friends in this area unless we see that this grain reaches the people who actually need it. About 18 months ago I was in Calcutta, India, months after passage of that grain bill in the United States Congress. I was told there that only one person out of a thousand in India had ever heard about the American grain bill being passed in the United States. Why? As the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd], certainly should know, the people in this area of the world are about 90 percent illiterate. They have no communication systems of any kind, and contrary to what the gentleman from Minnesota said, they do not carry grain in Pakistan on donkeys and water buffalos. The means of transportation there principally is the camel. We saw the camel markets there. I think that we certainly should let the Red Cross, with its agents and employees trained in the administration of this very type of work, do it free to the taxpayers of this country. They have the organization.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman from South Carolina know that there presently are between 75 and 100 flunkies of 1 description or another sent over by the United Nations, and does he not think if the Red Cross is designated—and I am for his amendment—that their feelings are going to be hurt?

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. It makes no difference if they are. I have been to so many of these countries and I have seen so many representatives of the United Nations and of the United States who know so awfully, woefully little about the administration of this type of program that it is just sad to see them, and I think it is time to get some people abroad who know something about the administration of this sort of a program.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. If the services of the Red Cross are needed, is it reasonable to assume that the Red Cross would be ready to assume such responsibilities as are needed in the distribution of this food?

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Certainly. They have the organization and facilities already in Pakistan. The president of the American Red Cross assured me this morning that they would be delighted to do so. My amendment stipulates that they be requested to lend their services.

Mr. COOLEY. Why would you want to request them to render their services

or tender their services unless Pakistan feels the need of the American Red Cross?

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. The American Red Cross would work only in cooperation with the Pakistan Red Cross. The amendment further states "in cooperation with the Government of the United States and the Government of Pakistan." The Government of Pakistan would welcome the assistance of this great organization which has done so much to relieve suffering humanity all over the world.

Mr. COOLEY. The legislation before us contemplates an agreement to be written by the President.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. My amendment only provides that the Government of the United States and the Government of Pakistan request the assistance of the Red Cross in distributing the grain in Pakistan. If this amendment is adopted I am sure these Governments, with Red Cross participation, can do a better job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DORN of South Carolina was permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I think it appropriate to give you an example of just what is going on all over the world. I walked into the Imperial Hotel in Tokyo some months ago and there I met a Member of this House who had just returned from a visit to the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru. Mr. Nehru said this to that Member of the House: "I do not like America. They are too dollar-minded. They seem to think things can be done in terms of dollars." He continued, "Even when I visited the United States, where did they take me? They took me to Wall Street and showed me the corporations and talked in terms of how many millions of dollars this corporation represented and how many hundreds of millions of dollars that individual represented." Mr. Nehru did not see the grassroots of America. He did not see what makes America tick.

The gentleman from North Carolina, who came up here a few minutes ago and submitted his very able amendment, was with me on that occasion. He was with me in India, where we saw bodies being hauled off the streets of Calcutta as the result of starvation after the American grain bill had been in operation for some months, simply because the poor people did not have the money to buy any of the grain.

Where did the grain go in India? It went to the millionaire merchants of Calcutta. It went to the political henchmen of those in power in government. If you want to know the truth, it did more harm than good. And I charge here this afternoon that this bill will do this country more harm than good. Look at that clause in there about publicity. That shows you how much the people who drew up this bill know about conditions over there. Eighty-five or ninety percent of the people in Pakistan cannot read or write. Only about one

out of every thousand has a radio set. How are they going to know that the grain came from the United States or the people of this country?

I remember 6 years ago I stood here and asked the distinguished present Governor of Massachusetts, your great Governor Herter—and he was considered by all to be an authority on foreign relief—how much of the aid we were sending to China at that time was reaching the interior and going to the people who actually needed it. Look in the RECORD. Do you know what his answer was? Only 2 percent. Percentage-wise, in reaching the needy people all of these bills that come before this House are little better.

I have as much feeling in my heart for the underprivileged as anyone. I gave food to the Germans in Germany after the war, when the United States Army, under the Morgenthau plan, had orders to throw all the garbage in the river over there and to keep the starving people from getting it. I believe in charity. I do think charity is something of the heart. It is something that should be administered from one brother to another in a spirit of love and understanding, not this high-handed method of voting the taxpayers' money of one country to the government of another, and then you write out in the bill a provision permitting them to sell it. In other words, you encourage that they sell the grain. Sell it to whom? To those people who, in turn, want to sell it again and make money out of it. I do not think that is right. I think this great organization, the Red Cross, is capable of administering, aiding, and assisting. Under my amendment, we do not direct that they take charge of it, only aid and assist in the administration of this program. They certainly would see to it that the people who really need this grain get it.

What about the people at Flint, Mich., where they were struck by the tornado? What about the people in Massachusetts? The Red Cross moved in in a very few minutes and did a marvelous job. All I am asking here is that they aid and assist in the distribution of this grain, in determining those who are unable to pay for it. Under this bill, you say that some of them are going to get aid because they cannot pay for it, but who is going to determine that factor? The Government of Pakistan, of course. The Government of this country would not send relief to the mayor of any American city. You would turn it over to some organization that is trained and equipped to do that very job.

I think it is high time that we as representatives of the people of this great country do something about these programs which recur constantly, and, of my own personal observation, have done more harm than good in foreign countries.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am wholly sympathetic to the idea of the gentleman from South Carolina as far as the purpose that he seeks to accomplish is concerned, but I am sure the amendment he offers

would only serve to confuse the situation and make it almost impossible to administer this program. Certainly it would be an infringement upon the sovereignty of Pakistan if it were put in the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this particular amendment conclude at the end of the gentleman's remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I hope everybody will take a good look at this amendment before he votes on it. To send in a private foreign agency, even as respected a one as the American Red Cross, to supervise any government's operations would be, in my opinion, as unjustified and properly resented an act of imperialism as almost anything one can think of, and it would be especially unwise in a country which fought for 200 years to get out from under white men's control. I know that is not the purpose of the gentleman from South Carolina, as is perfectly obvious, but his language is not just "aid and assist" but "aid, assist, and supervise." Surely the gentleman does not want either an official agency or a private agency from one country to go into another country and to supervise the carrying on of that government's own government operations.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. It would be done upon request and upon an agreement between the Government of Pakistan and the Government of the United States.

Mr. JUDD. I would suggest that the gentleman withdraw his amendment, and after this bill is passed, try to get the Mutual Security Agency to offer in its negotiations with the Government of Pakistan that if the latter needs such assistance, the American Red Cross and other American experts in this field of furnishing food relief will be glad to assist them. But to require by statute that a friendly government's operations be supervised by a private American agency seems to me to be an unnecessary, unjustifiable and gratuitous insult. I hope very much the gentleman will not press his amendment.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. If the gentleman will yield permit me to ask the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota what is point 4 aid?

Mr. HOPE. No; I cannot yield further at this time. The gentleman had 10 minutes to discuss his amendment.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. This is the first 10 minutes I have ever had on this floor except the few minutes I had last week.

Mr. HOPE. I will yield to the gentleman later, if I have the time.

Dr. DORN of South Carolina. This is the first amendment I have ever in-

troduced in the House of Representatives and this is my third term as a Member of the House. I feel the House would like to hear something about this. As the gentleman said a moment ago, this is confusing. If there is anything more confusing than this bill, I would like to see it.

Mr. HOPE. Let me show how the gentleman's amendment would confuse the administration of this program. The program is going to be administered in the villages through the rationing boards. All food is rationed in Pakistan as I understand it. I know that wheat is rationed. If we are going to put in the bill that representatives of the Red Cross are going to supervise the rationing procedures in a sovereign country like Pakistan, it will not only be confusing but it would, of course, be an infringement upon their sovereignty. It could not help but interfere seriously with the administration of the program.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DORN of South Carolina) there were—ayes 51, noes 91.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: On page 3, line 5, strike out the period and insert a comma and add the following: "and provided further that no part of the wheat furnished hereunder shall be sold by the Government of Pakistan."

[Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from South Carolina: We are in a state of confusion; in fact, it is a great understatement when we say we are in a state of confusion. We have heard statements made this afternoon that in India millionaires got the money, that we are in worse shape today than we were before we let them have the money to purchase grain. Then we have another Member who challenges that statement, plus the fact that we heard our good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] say that the Pakistan fleet has been hauling materials to Communist Russia. No one has denied that. Then we have had contradictory statements, one saying this is charity, the other saying it is not charity; one saying it goes for the relief of the Government of Pakistan, and the other saying it goes to the hungry and starving people of Pakistan. We are in a state of utter confusion just like it was on the Committee on Agriculture when the bill came up there. I was not there when it was voted out because the TVA bill was being debated on the floor at the time. I would have voted against it and it would not have come out unani-

mously had I been there; so that is the reason why this bill came out of the Committee on Agriculture by a unanimous vote, because PAT SUTTON of Tennessee was on the floor of the House attending to a TVA matter—as I was greatly interested in the discussion of TVA.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman from Minnesota made the statement—and he may correct me if I am wrong—that it would be an insult to Pakistan if we asked the American Red Cross, an international organization, to supervise the distribution of this wheat, so that the poverty-stricken people of Pakistan would receive it. I cannot understand why you make that statement.

Mr. SUTTON. I think it is an insult to the integrity and to the pocketbook of the American people to give this \$122 million away. This last week we passed a bill providing \$4,900,000,000 for the Mutual Security Administration of which \$27½ million in economic aid went to Pakistan. Now, instead of asking this Congress for \$5 billion—they did not do that—they asked for the \$4.9 billion, then come in through the back door, to our Committee on Agriculture, and request \$122 million of foreign aid through, shall we say, wheat? To me that is just a backhanded method for asking \$5 billion for foreign spending.

How much longer is the American taxpayer going to have to dig down in his pocket to provide for the economic welfare of countries throughout the world? How much longer are you going to continue to tax the American people for that purpose? To me it seems assinine, as much in debt as we are, as high as taxes are. No wonder we cannot get the Reed bill out. The Congress is responsible, however it will not vote against these Santa Claus programs, and close Uncle Sam's gift shop.

For 20 years you have been saying that the Democratic Party is the "Santa Claus Party," the one that is giving this country away. I for one have not been guilty of that practice. I thought last November when you Republicans won there would be a change. You said we would have a change. But what happens? Now the leadership of the Democratic Party and the leadership of the Republican Party join together in a Santa Claus coalition party. As far as this Democrat is concerned, I am for the American people, I am for reducing taxes, balancing the budget, and to cease giving money away to foreign governments.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It took the gentleman a long time to find that out.

Mr. SUTTON. Not me. I have consistently opposed our huge give-away program.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That the Republican and the Democratic

leaderships have joined together. That is what I mean. It took you a long time to find that out.

Mr. SUTTON. We thought after November there would be a radical change. Right here I want to call to the attention of Congress a news bulletin dated Friday, June 19, and prepared by Mr. Paul O. Peters. The bulletin reads as follows:

MR. CONGRESSMAN, NOW IS THE TIME TO CLOSE UNCLE SAM'S INTERNATIONAL GIFT SHOP

Mutual Security Agency's press release No. 332, dated June 15, 1953, summarizes the funds allotted to Western European countries and the European Payments Union during the fiscal year which ends June 30, less than 2 weeks from now, as follows:

Austria.....	\$35,000,000
Denmark.....	1 6,000,000
France.....	1 397,500,000
Germany.....	23,787,000
Greece.....	80,000,000
Iceland.....	5,450,000
Italy.....	102,000,000
Netherlands.....	1 1,500,000
Norway.....	1 21,200,000
Turkey.....	54,000,000
United Kingdom.....	1 409,000,000
Yugoslavia.....	121,750,000
European Payments Union.....	227,000

Total allocated..... 1,257,414,000

¹ Includes funds for the promotion of productivity as follows: Denmark, \$1,500,000; France, \$30 million; Italy, \$22 million; Netherlands, \$1,500,000; Norway, \$4 million; United Kingdom, \$9 million.

The appropriations for Mutual Security Agency for fiscal 1953 was in the amount of \$5,904,055,223.48 according to the Treasury records.

After deducting the amounts allocated to the western European nations, and the relatively small amounts for Formosa and the far eastern countries the unallocated balance of the current year's appropriation is over \$4,500,000,000. It also is disclosed by the Treasury statement for June 15, 1953, that the total of unexpended balances to the credit of the Mutual Security Agency on that date was \$10,504,091,437.

What Member of Congress, being possessed of his right mind and recognizing the responsibilities attached to his office will go along and appropriate more billions to continue the operations of Uncle Sam's international gift shop, knowing that the money is not now needed and cannot be spent in fiscal 1954?

Let's close up our foreign charities and bring our own budget in balance.

The American people are not to be fooled into total bankruptcy by the internationalists who want to give away our money and resources.

PAUL O. PETERS.

I congratulate Mr. Peters sincerely and trust that this Congress will take heed.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, strikes at the very heart of the bill because if this bill is going to accomplish anything the transactions thereunder will have to be handled in the manner set out in the bill. The terms of the bill provide that we furnish "such supplies free of cost to persons who, by virtue of circumstances beyond their control, are unable to pay for them." That is expected to take care

of any of the people in Pakistan who do not have local currency and therefore cannot purchase these supplies. Wheat distributed under that part of the bill will be handled the same as wheat which is sold as far as distribution is concerned. By that I mean it will all be handled by local boards.

If we were to provide that all wheat we send over there shall be given free to the people of Pakistan, it seems to me it would be quite demoralizing. If the Government is going to give everyone a handout of free wheat, why should anybody work, especially when wheat constitutes two-thirds of the diet of the people of Pakistan? There would be nothing more demoralizing than to carry out that part of the program in the manner suggested by this amendment. Furthermore if we carried out the program in that way we would be doing only half of what we attempt to do under this legislation because the rupees that are paid in by those who purchase the wheat go into a special fund. This special fund is to be used in improving the agriculture of the country, including the construction of irrigation works, so that this calamity will not occur again. We are going to help them build up their agriculture through their own funds collected from the sale of this wheat. That would be impossible if we compelled the Government of Pakistan to give it all away.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is adopted, we would be inviting a recurrence of the same food shortage and the same problem might again be on our doorstep in the future? For we would be depriving the Pakistan Government of some \$70 million in rupees which it otherwise, under the bill as written, can obtain and use to develop its agricultural productive capacity in order to prevent recurrence by increasing its production of wheat? Why, even under the impulse of charity, should we ask these people to continue in a situation where they may remain dependent upon our further charity?

Mr. HOPE. I agree 100 percent with the statement which the gentleman has made and which so well covers the point.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Not if it comes out of my time.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the request I am about to make not be taken out of the gentleman's time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. BENDER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the great shows of compassion that we have witnessed on the floor this afternoon for the poor, starving people of Pakistan have not been without their effect. I thought that I was impervious to such arguments, but even I am ready to admit that there is a great deal of merit in this legislation, surely from its humanitarian aspect. I am willing to concede that there is great need in Pakistan for this wheat. I recognize also that this wheat is going to be used for the high purpose of relieving human suffering, and yet I am constrained to oppose the legislation.

Now you may say that this is being inconsistent. It is not, and I am going to tell you why. It is simply because I regard my responsibility under my oath as a Member of the Congress as being greater than my obligation to vote charity abroad. It might be heresy to mention the Constitution of the United States and the Congress in these days and times, but I am going to do it.

For 7 years I sat in this House and watched you vote billions and billions of dollars overseas for the benefit of foreign countries, and only once or twice have I heard anyone raise the question of whether or not such action comes within the limitation of powers delegated to the Congress by the Constitution.

So, this morning I got out that document and I read it over again. I reread the enumeration of powers delegated to Congress under the Constitution. You will find Congress' powers listed and specifically set out in article I, section 8. Generally, it states that the Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts, and provide for the common defense and general welfare on the United States. You can read the section that enumerates the powers of the Congress, and nowhere in it will you find that Congress is given the power to take the people's tax moneys for the purpose of carrying on world philanthropies—unless it can be shown that it promotes the general welfare of the United States. And, you know that the general welfare clause has been stretched so far out of shape that some people in the United States do not even know that there are any limitations on the powers of Congress. Have we really given serious thought as to whether or not we have the authority to ship this wheat abroad as a gift? You have said it was charity. It is charity. Certainly it is charity. Do we have the authority to use the people's money for foreign charity. I think not.

I consider us as the trustees of the people's tax money, with the authority to spend it in the manner and within the scope of our powers as enumerated in the Constitution of the United States. If the occasion ever arises where we feel we should spend their money in such a manner as is not authorized by the Con-

stitution of the United States, then we should submit it to the people for their approval and in the way the Constitution provides. I hope that before this debate ends someone will address himself to the point of the bill's constitutionality.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. No doubt the constitutionality of this proposition is the very reason the rule provided that all points of order against the bill were waived.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Possibly; I do not know. But where there is a doubt, I, for one, am ready to resolve that doubt in favor of the Constitution. That is the reason I intend to vote against this measure, no matter how meritorious it may be otherwise, because I do not feel that the Congress properly has the authority under the Constitution to act in such a manner with the people's money.

I feel as Abraham Lincoln did many years ago, when he stated that I think should be the creed of every man who serves in Congress. He said: "No man can conscientiously vote for what he believes to be an unconstitutional measure, no matter how expedient he might consider it." With that I must agree.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this bill and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that debate has been cut off on this bill and that I have only 1½ minutes to try to persuade the House not to divest itself of its appropriation powers as it is doing in this bill. I have an amendment that I thought was going to accomplish the same purposes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] had in mind. The thing I am concerned about is that this bill bypasses the Appropriations Committee. Far from appropriating \$100 million, it actually is going to hit the United States for about \$200 million, because we have about \$100 million in wheat we are giving away, and then we are tying the hands of the Appropriations Committee where they are going to have to appropriate another \$100 million for the Commodity Credit Corporation, plus the \$20 million that will be used for shipping this wheat abroad.

Turn to page 3 of the bill and you will see that what is going to happen in this matter is that there is going to be turned over to the counterpart fund, one of those funds where the Congress loses control over the expenditures, anywhere up to \$100 million. The amendment I am going to offer is at page 3, line 20, to add:

Provided, That all appropriations for such programs and projects must be approved by the Congress of the United States.

I call your attention to the language in line 18 on page 3 where it says that not only can these funds be used to increase food production but "for other projects and programs." In other words, it is a complete blank check for about \$100 million, and I think the Congress should maintain control over it.

The foregoing is the extent of what I was able to say on the floor of the House in the 1½ minutes allotted to me to speak.

I appreciate the fact that it was 5 o'clock in the afternoon when we reached the part of the bill where it was appropriate for me to offer the amendment I had in mind. I further appreciate that the membership of the House was tired of listening to the debate on the bill and had pretty well resigned themselves to voting for it without amendment regardless of what else was to be said on the floor of the House.

However, I cannot refrain from stating that it is a pretty sorry commentary on the interest in the principle of the separation of powers and the independence of the legislative branch of Government when the legislative branch without debate can so quickly divest itself of 1 of the 2 basic powers it possesses, the power to appropriate money, in this instance, to the tune of \$200 million. I can well understand why the chairman of the committee and the leadership were so anxious to ring down the curtain on this sorry episode. The less discussion on these matters the better. The less discussion on the very vital question presented by the gentleman from Mississippi, Is this constitutional, the better.

I want to say to the leadership, both of the House and in the White House, that this is the second time on the floor of the House the question has been raised about the constitutionality of a certain bill where the majority of the Members privately conceded that in their opinion the bill was unconstitutional, but no one from the leadership in either party dared take the floor to state why, in their opinion, the bill was constitutional.

So far, indeed, have we gone from our oaths of office. So far, indeed, have we departed from a responsible Government looking to the future, in exchange for a fearful shortsighted organization of men who feel that every problem of their day is so unusual, so baffling, so momentous that that problem must be decided upon the basis of that problem alone—it must be decided upon expediency—on emergency.

Well, I dare suggest that until we face up to the fact that, though the problems of today are hard, they must be decided upon the basis of principle we will continue to flounder. And, indeed, we will continue to be unable to lead other nations in the world. Surely, we should have learned by the past few years' experience that we cannot lead with either bullets or dollars or wheat.

What we had today was an appropriation on a legislative bill. This is just as

bad and just as subject to a point of order as legislation on an appropriation bill. I regret to state that I was the only Member who thought this matter was important enough to call it to the attention of the House albeit I had only a minute and a half in which to try to do it.

The leadership knew this was irregular procedure, and I trust they knew it was bad procedure inasmuch as the rules of the House outlawed it. That is the reason a rule was obtained from the Rules Committee waiving points of order. I asked the chairman of the Appropriations Committee if he had been notified that this appropriation bill was being brought on the floor out of the Agriculture Committee and he stated, "No." I would have thought that at least the chairman of the Appropriations Committee might have been notified when his committee was being bypassed, particularly when the sum amounted to around \$200 million.

I want to briefly discuss the amount of the appropriation. In this bill we made three appropriations:

First. We appropriated wheat which had cost \$100 million of taxpayers' money and gave it to the Government of Pakistan.

Second. We said that the Commodity Credit Corporation which was accountable for the wheat would get \$100 million from the taxpayers in lieu of the wheat. Of course, the Appropriations Committee will actually have to appropriate this money, but I ask anyone under such circumstances does the Appropriations Committee have any alternative?

Third. We appropriated \$20 million, I presume from CCC funds, the amount to cover the transportation of the wheat. This too is to be replaced by appropriating the money from the taxpayer.

Now it is argued that inasmuch as the \$100 million which will replace the taken wheat will be used to buy more surplus, presumably wheat, the net loss to the taxpayer is only the \$120 million. However, I suggest as far as the Appropriations Committee is concerned it is the Agriculture Committee which has in effect extended the CCC program for another \$100 million, not the Appropriations Committee. In other words this bill has actually had the say of where \$100 million of wheat is to go and \$120 million of cash.

The wheat will be converted to cash in Pakistan and the State Department will have up to \$100 million more to play with for point 4 and, indeed, for other projects and programs with no limitation at all to point 4 purposes. This is where the State Department gets free funds to play the lady bountiful with, completely at its discretion, with no control vested in the Congress. It is from bills like this that we get the contingent liabilities which so plague the Appropriations Committee.

This bill amounts almost to a fraud. It comes clothed as a charity donation to the starving people of Pakistan and yet 300,000 tons are definitely for a reserve and we learn that 70 percent of the remaining tonnage will be sold and the pro-

ceeds put in counterpart funds. And \$20 million is earmarked for private enterprise which will transport the wheat.

If the purpose was as stated why was not the matter processed in accordance with proper legislative procedure? Indeed I might further state why is the Federal Government so insistent in moving into the fields which formerly belonged to private charities and our churches? The proper and constitutional method of demonstrating our good will and interest in our brother abroad is through these agencies.

I might further suggest if we would go back and follow the constitutional and proper procedure for aiding unfortunate peoples abroad we would be able to escape the telling propaganda of Russia which accuses the United States Government of supporting some of the rottenest governments in history on the backs of the people.

If we permitted our churches and our other private organizations to handle the job there could be no such accusations. Furthermore, I am satisfied we would get more real charity per dollar. Finally we would get good will and not questionable will which our Government dollars seem to buy.

We see here one further evidence of the ineffectiveness of Socialist government, of Socialist missionary work, Socialist charity instead of private missionary work and private charity. Someday I hope we will learn that government does not perform well or efficiently in the field of private enterprise. That government's proper sphere is supervision and regulation, not performance.

I am afraid until we do learn this we run the continued risk of not having friends abroad and the continued risk of national insolvency.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 65, noes 110.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion, but I ask first whether that would come out of the 10 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The time would have to come out of the 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will wait until the 10 minutes have expired and will not offer the preferential motion at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 1, line 6, strike out "one million" and insert "900,000" and after the word "wheat" on line 7 insert "100,000 long tons of grade A corn meal."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment as just read speaks for itself. As everyone knows, there is no better food, there is no more nourishing food, there is no more tasty food than cornbread or corn mush or corn pone. Certainly the people of Pakistan would

like to have a choice as to whether they want to eat all wheat bread or balance their diet with cornbread or corn pone or corn mush. As all of you know, in the House restaurant where delicious Iowa tall-corn bread has been on the menu during the last session of Congress and this session the restaurant runs out of that fine food most every day, because of the great demand for this wonderful food. America has a surplus of corn. We are going to have considerable trouble in finding storage space for this year's crop.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. I think my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota made a wonderful speech last week on the foreign-aid bill. But if he wants to know where I got my information about the conditions in India, and about these people, may I inform him I did not get it from the cocktail diplomats or from the ECA mission which gets up with a big blackboard and goes to great lengths with a whole lot of carefully prepared figures for visiting Congressmen.

I got it from the representatives of American business who have to know the real conditions in a country in order to succeed in business. Also, many of our Government representatives admitted off the record that the India grain bill did not reach the people who needed it most.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to proceed. I have offered a very important amendment and I would like to use all my time to explain it.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to my friend Mr. SUTTON.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be given to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Cornbread, corn mush, and corn pone is the cheapest of all foods and it is good. Without taking more time of the House, I am sure every Member will recognize the justification of my request and will vote for my amendment which provides that 100,000 long tons of grade A cornmeal be included in this legislation and supplied to the hungry people of Pakistan and in accordance with the other provisions in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I came on the floor of the House this afternoon with the full and honest intention of voting for this bill, as I voted 2 years ago for wheat for India, to indicate my interest in helping starving people anywhere and in proof of what I hold is the good, old-fashioned tradition of showing loving kindness and mercy.

I admit that I am a bit confused and I am talking a minute and a half here to ask this question, either of Dr. JUDD or of Mr. HOPE, the chairman of the committee.

Has any estimate been made by either of the committees, or has any information been offered by the Ambassador from Pakistan which would show how much of this wheat is apt to be sold and how much is really a gift?

Mr. HOPE. I will be glad to say to the gentlewoman from Illinois that the testimony before our committee by Dr. Reed, who was sent over by the American Government to investigate the situation, was that approximately 70 percent would probably be sold and 30 percent would be given to needy people.

Mrs. CHURCH. In other words, then, I would say that 30 percent is a gift and 70 percent might become a commercial transaction.

Mr. HOPE. It will be handled by the Government of Pakistan and sold just as they sell all their wheat.

Mrs. CHURCH. I reiterate that I would be glad to vote the entire 100 percent if it were to relieve suffering. I am beginning to have some doubt about the 70 percent that we are going to treat in that way.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CHURCH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The people who are able to pay in rupees for this grain but who cannot get it unless this bill is passed are in as great need of wheat as are those who are unable to pay.

Mrs. CHURCH. Certainly. But could not that 70 percent be used to pay back what we are paying for the wheat?

Mr. JUDD. No, unless you can get the American Government or the Commodity Credit Corporation to take Pakistan rupees; but that currency is not convertible into dollars. That is the whole nubbin of the trouble.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman to explain the counterpart fund that is contemplated by the provision in the present act. I think that would help to clear up the situation.

Mr. JUDD. The counterpart fund that is provided for in paragraph (d) on page 3 is the same provision that we have in all of our various foreign-aid acts.

Whenever we give commodity assistance to countries which are not able to get our commodities because of their lack of dollars, it has been provided that where the goods could be sold to its people by the recipient government in exchange for local currency from those who ultimately used the aid, the funds went into a so-called counterpart fund to be controlled jointly by the government of the recipient country and the Government of the United States. Neither side could use it without the

agreement of the other. It was to be used in ways that were approved by both and were for the benefit of that country. That is the provision in this bill also. When some 70 percent of the wheat is sold to those with the capacity to pay for it in rupees, the receipts to be used by Pakistan and ourselves for the economic and agricultural development of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, last week we passed a mutual security bill, and according to my recollection the Pakistan Government or country received the exact number of dollars which the State Department recommended that they should receive in the way of economic aid.

It has been disclosed that this bill will in a sense be an economic aid bill inasmuch as 70 percent of the wheat which will be transported to Pakistan will be sold by the Pakistan Government and the proceeds amounting from anywhere from \$50 million to \$75 million or \$80 million—\$80 million, I believe it is—will go into the treasury of the Pakistan Government. Inasmuch as the Pakistan Government is going to profit to the extent of millions upon millions I certainly feel that it should be required to pay the freight on the wheat from this country to Pakistan, and therefore, after all debate has been concluded, if the Chair will recognize me it will be my purpose to offer a motion to recommit the bill with instructions to report it back forthwith with an amendment which in all respects is the equivalent of the Poage amendment to require them to pay the freight on this wheat.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] to close the debate.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to use further time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would just like to have it made clear, if I may, that insofar as the United States is concerned all of this wheat is a gift, that the part that might not be a gift is from the Pakistan Government to the people of Pakistan, but insofar as the United States is concerned the whole amount is a gift. Is that not correct?

Mr. HOPE. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: Page 3, line 20, after "Pakistan", change the period to a semicolon and add the following: "Provided, That all appropriations for such programs and projects must be approved by the Congress of the United States"; and on page 4, line 3, after "United States", change the period to a semicolon and add: "Provided, That all appropriations for such programs and projects must be approved by the Congress of the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri) there were—ayes 52, noes 123.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to inquire if that motion is in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The committee amendments were adopted.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this time is taken now only because of requests that have come to me for information. Some time ago the President sent up Reorganization Plan No. 6 designed to reorganize the Department of Defense. Hearings were held by the Committee on Government Operations. Those hearings will be printed tonight and will be ready and available tomorrow morning.

Yesterday the committee reported Resolution 264 which accepts the plan as offered by the President with the exception of two sections (c) and (d) which have but one purpose. That purpose is to give the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff authority to disapprove members of the Joint Chiefs, some 210 of them, and to direct the activities of the staffs. Other than that the resolution reported out yesterday approves of the plan, although there were other objections.

We asked the Committee on Rules for a hearing and I was advised this morning that we would not get it. That is the privilege of that committee. Tomorrow at 10 o'clock the committee will vote on a proposition to give the House an opportunity to debate plan No. 6.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Com-

mittee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5659) to provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan, pursuant to House Resolution 293, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ABERNETHY moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: Page 2, line 6, after the word "President", strike out the period and insert "without further cost to the United States or its agencies."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ABERNETHY) there were—ayes 84, noes 175.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 310, nays 75, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]

YEAS—310

Abbutt	Betts	Canfield
Addonizio	Boggs	Cannon
Albert	Boland	Carnahan
Allen, Calif.	Bolling	Carrigg
Allen, Ill.	Bolton	Case
Andersen,	Frances P.	Cederberg
H. Carl	Bolton,	Celler
Andresen,	Oliver P.	Chelf
August H.	Bonin	Chenoweth
Andrews	Bosch	Church
Angell	Bow	Condon
Arends	Boykin	Cooley
Ashmore	Bramblett	Coon
Aspinall	Bray	Cooper
Auchincloss	Brooks, Tex.	Corbett
Ayres	Brown, Ga.	Cotton
Baker	Brown, Ohio	Cretella
Barrett	Brownson	Crosser
Bates	Broyhill	Crumpacker
Battle	Buchanan	Cunningham
Beamer	Budge	Curtiss, Mass.
Belcher	Burdick	Curtiss, Nebr.
Bender	Byrd	Dague
Bennett, Fla.	Byrne, Pa.	Davis, Tenn.
Bennett, Mich.	Byrnes, Wis.	Davis, Wis.
Bentley	Camp	Dawson, Ill.
Berry	Campbell	Dawson, Utah

Deane	Jensen	Pillion
Delaney	Johnson	Poage
Derounian	Jonas, N. C.	Poff
Devereux	Jones, Ala.	Polk
D'Ewart	Judd	Powell
Dingell	Karsten, Mo.	Preston
Dodd	Kean	Price
Dollinger	Kearns	Priest
Donohue	Keating	Pruoty
Dorn, N. Y.	Kee	Rabaut
Doyle	Kelley, Pa.	Radwan
Durham	Kelly, N. Y.	Ralms
Eberharter	Keogh	Ray
Edmondson	Kersten, Wis.	Rayburn
Elliott	Kilburn	Reams
Ellsworth	Kilday	Reece, Tenn.
Evins	Kling, Calif.	Rees, Kans.
Fallon	King, Pa.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Feighan	Kirwan	Rhodes, Pa.
Fenton	Klein	Richards
Fernandez	Kluczynski	Riehman
Fine	Knox	Riley
Forand	Kruger	Roberts
Ford	Laird	Robison, Ky.
Frazier	Lane	Rodino
Friedel	Lanham	Rogers, Colo.
Fulton	Lantaff	Rogers, Mass.
Gamble	Latham	Rooney
Garmatz	LeCompte	Roosevelt
Gary	Lesinski	Sadlak
Gathings	Lovre	Saylor
Gavin	McCarthy	Schenck
George	McConnell	Scherer
Goodwin	McCormack	Scott
Gordon	McCulloch	Scudder
Graham	McDonough	Seeley-Brown
Granahan	McGregor	Shelley
Grant	McIntire	Sheppard
Gregory	McMillan	Sleminski
Gubser	Machrowicz	Sikes
Gwinn	Mack, Wash.	Small
Hagen, Calif.	Madden	Smith, Miss.
Hagen, Minn.	Magnuson	Spence
Halleck	Mahon	Springer
Harden	Mailliard	Staggers
Hardy	Marshall	Steed
Harrison, Nebr.	Martin, Iowa	Sullivan
Harrison, Va.	Matthews	Talle
Harrison, Wyo.	Merrill	Teague
Harvey	Merrow	Thompson, Tex.
Hays, Ark.	Metcalfe	Tollefson
Hays, Ohio	Miller, Kans.	Trimble
Hébert	Miller, Md.	Tuck
Heller	Miller, Nebr.	Utt
Heseltan	Miller, N. Y.	Van Zandt
Hess	Mills	Vorys
Hiestand	Mollohan	Vorsell
Hill	Morano	Wainwright
Hillelson	Morgan	Walter
Hillings	Moss	Wampler
Hinschaw	Moulder	Warburton
Hoeven	Multer	Watts
Hollifield	Mumma	Weichel
Holmes	Neal	Westland
Holt	Norblad	Whitten
Holtzman	O'Brien, Ill.	Wickersham
Hope	O'Brien, Mich.	Widnall
Horan	O'Brien, N. Y.	Wier
Hosmer	O'Hara, Ill.	Williams, N. Y.
Howell	O'Neil	Wilson, Calif.
Hruska	Osmers	Wilson, Ind.
Hunter	Ostertag	Wolcott
Hyde	Patman	Wolverton
Jackson	Patterson	Yorty
James	Pelly	Young
Jarman	Perkins	Younger
Javits	Pfost	Zablocki
Jenkins	Pilcher	

NAYS—75

Abernethy	Fisher	Reed, N. Y.
Alexander	Forrester	Rivers
Bailey	Fountain	Robeson, Va.
Barden	Gentry	Rogers, Fla.
Bentsen	Gross	Rogers, Tex.
Bishop	Haley	Scrivner
Bonner	Hand	Selden
Brooks, La.	Harris	Shafer
Burleson	Herlong	Sheehan
Carlyle	Hoffman, Mich.	Short
Clardy	Jones, Ill.	Shuford
Celevenger	Jones, Mo.	Simpson, Ill.
Cole, Mo.	Jones, N. C.	Smith, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.	Landrum	Smith, Va.
Colmer	Long	Smith, Wis.
Coudert	Lyle	Sutton
Curtis, Mo.	Mason	Taber
Davis, Ga.	Murray	Thomas
Dempsey	Nicholson	Thompson, La.
Dondero	Norrell	Thompson, Mich.
Dorn, S. C.	Passman	Van Pelt
Dowdy	Patten	Velde
Engle	Reed, Ill.	

Wharton	Willis	Withrow
Wheeler	Wilson, Tex.	
Williams, Miss.	Winstead	

NOT VOTING—45

Adair	Golden	O'Hara, Minn.
Becker	Green	O'Konski
Blatnik	Hale	Philbin
Buckley	Hart	Phillips
Busbey	Hoffman, Ill.	Regan
Bush	Ikard	St. George
Chaham	Kearney	Secrest
Chilperfield	Lucas	Simpson, Pa.
Chudoff	McVey	Stauffer
Dies	Mack, Ill.	Stringfellow
Dolliver	Meador	Taylor
Donovan	Miller, Calif.	Thornberry
Fino	Morrison	Vinson
Fogarty	Nelson	Wigglesworth
Frelinghuysen	Oakman	Yates

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Dies against.

Mr. Thornberry for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mrs. St. George for, with Mr. McVey against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Wigglesworth with Mr. Morrison.

Mr. Taylor with Mr. Chatham.

Mr. Stringfellow with Mr. Fogarty.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. Bush with Mr. Chudoff.

Mr. Becker with Mr. Blatnik.

Mr. Adair with Mr. Hart.

Mr. Stauffer with Mr. Green.

Mr. Kearney with Mr. Secrest.

Mr. Fino with Mr. Ikard.

Mr. Dolliver with Mr. Lucas.

Mr. Oakman with Mr. Yates.

Mr. Nelson with Mr. Vinson.

Mr. Chilperfield with Mr. Regan.

Mr. Golden with Mr. Mack of Illinois.

Mr. Hale with Mr. Miller of California.

Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota with Mr. Philbin.

Mr. Phillips with Mr. Donovan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table for immediate consideration the bill (S. 2112) to provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan, which is similar to the bill just passed. If this consent is granted I shall offer an amendment to make the bills identical.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to make available to the President out of wheat stocks acquired through price-support operations not to exceed 1 million long tons of wheat, during the period ending June 30, 1954, for transfer to the Government of Pakistan upon such terms and conditions as the President determines appropriate, of which 700,000 tons may be made available in order to alleviate starvation and mass suffering threatened by famine conditions in Pakistan and not to exceed 300,000 tons to provide such reserve supply, as he may determine to be a necessary supplement to such emergency assistance. Commodity Credit Corporation shall deliver the wheat on board vessels in United States ports as directed by the President. At least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of wheat made available under this act and transported from the

United States on ocean vessels shall be so transported on United States flag vessels to the extent practicable and to the extent such vessels are available at market rates for United States flag vessels.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of making payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities disposed of hereunder, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are equal to the Corporation's investment in such commodities, including handling costs, plus the costs incurred in making deliveries hereunder. Any funds or other assets available to the Commodity Credit Corporation may be used, in advance of such appropriation or payments, for carrying out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 3. No assistance under authority of this act shall be made available until an agreement is entered into between Pakistan and the United States containing the following undertakings, and any others the President may determine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of this act, on the part of Pakistan:

(a) To distribute the supplies made available under this act among the people of Pakistan without discrimination and to provide such supplies free of cost to persons who, by virtue of circumstances beyond their control, are unable to pay for them.

(b) To give full and continuous publicity in Pakistan to the assistance furnished by the United States.

(c) To permit persons designated by the Government of the United States to observe without restriction the distribution in Pakistan of supplies made available under authority of this act.

(d) To deposit in a special account amounts of the currency of Pakistan equivalent to the amounts of such currency accruing to the Government of Pakistan from the import and sale of commodities furnished as a grant hereunder, this account to be utilized as may be agreed upon by the United States and the Government of Pakistan for the benefit of the people of Pakistan in programs to increase food production and in other projects and programs in the mutual interest of the United States and Pakistan.

(e) To allocate to the use of the Government of the United States 5 percent of the local currency account established in subsection (d) for use, in accordance with applicable United States laws, for local currency requirements of the United States including administrative and operating expenses in Pakistan in connection with assistance supplied by the United States.

(f) To pursue all appropriate measures to reduce its relief needs and to increase production and supply and improve distribution of foodstuffs within Pakistan so as to lessen the danger of similar emergencies in the future.

SEC. 4. All or any part of the assistance provided hereunder shall be terminated by the President whenever he, or Congress by concurrent resolution, determines that because of changed conditions continuation of assistance is unnecessary or undesirable. Termination of assistance to Pakistan under this section may include the termination of deliveries of all supplies scheduled under this act and not yet delivered.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this act shall affect the applicability of section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, or other provisions of law to the local currency allocated to the use of the United States in accordance with the agreement provided for in section 3.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOPE: Page 3, line 9, after the words "furnished by the" insert "people of the."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings whereby the bill H. R. 5659 was passed were vacated and that bill was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2032. An act to modernize the charter of Washington Gas Light Co., and for other purposes;

S. 1839. An act to amend section 32 of the Fire and Casualty Act, so as to provide that an agent or solicitor may secure a license to solicit accident and health insurance in the District of Columbia under that act without taking the prescribed examination, if he is licensed under the Life Insurance Act; and

S. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4654) entitled "An act to provide for the exemption from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 of certain officers in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes."

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include a newspaper story and an editorial.)

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, recently in the debate on the appropriation for the TVA, my very good and able friend, Mr. ABERNETHY, of Mississippi, who I greatly admire, called to the attention of the House what President Eisenhower had to say before the election about the TVA.

At that time I questioned my good friend and stated that I was quite certain President Eisenhower did not talk about any steam power plants for the TVA.

Recently the Courier Journal in Louisville ran a story on this matter and here are the headlines, "Ike Calls Plan To Expand TVA Creeping Socialism."

I am placing this news article in the RECORD so all can read just how President Eisenhower feels about this matter:

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of June 18, 1953]

IKE CALLS PLAN TO EXPAND TVA CREEPING SOCIALISM

(By Robert L. Riggs)

WASHINGTON, June 17.—President Eisenhower said today he regards the proposal to

spend more Federal money to expand the Tennessee Valley Authority as an example of creeping socialism.

The President emphasized at his news conference that he is not out to destroy TVA. But he said we have reached this curious point in socialistic theory that all the Nation should provide funds for one region so that it can take industries away from other sections of the country.

Eisenhower's views, given in response to a reporter's question, came as the House of Representatives was engaged in a 2-day struggle over the very point he discussed—whether funds shall be appropriated for steam plants to expand the electric-power potential of the TVA.

CITES "OBLIGATION" ARGUMENT

The President pointed out that someone—identified only as "they"—had argued that the Federal Government had an obligation to spend more money for power production in the region.

"They" contended, he said, that since the Federal Government had seized and was creating a monopoly in power there, it was impossible for that locality to expand unless the Federal Government gave the agency more money.

"They" argued, the President said, that the region needed more power because industries from New England and other sections wanted to move into the Tennessee Valley to get cheap power, but couldn't do so unless the supply were increased.

CALLED AN EXPERIMENT

It seems to him, Eisenhower said, that we have to have some kind of reevaluation of all these things. He recalled that he has said a thousand times that he is not out to destroy TVA.

He described it as an experiment, but said that if it is repeated in other areas of the country, he wants the local people to have a greater interest and greater voice in it.

That attitude, he said, is what he calls the middle-of-the-road trend, in opposition to the socialistic idea that the central government is the controlling factor in every one of these great economic things.

Although the President gave no clue to who "they" were who made the TVA arguments to him, the principal advocate who pleaded recently with Eisenhower for power expansion in that region was Kentucky's Republican Senator, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER.

COOPER declined today to comment on Eisenhower's press conference statement about creeping socialism, but he did outline the arguments he presented to the President at a breakfast conference in the White House May 12.

HAD CUT \$30 MILLION

At the time COOPER made his breakfast visit, Eisenhower's Budget Director had cut from ex-President Truman's proposed budget for TVA \$30 million for a steam plant at Fulton, Tenn., 30 miles from Memphis. The budget director had cut out funds for an additional unit at the Kingston steam plant, though leaving in money for another unit at the John Sevier steamplant.

COOPER believes it was his exposition that caused the President to put back in the budget the money for the Kingston unit. The House Appropriations Committee agreed with the President in turning down the new plant at Fulton and in providing funds for the additional units at Kingston and John Sevier.

The House this afternoon rejected a move to give the TVA \$30 million extra to start work on the Fulton plant. Members also turned down a countermove to cut TVA funds of \$17.8 million and thus block plans to build additional steam-generating units at the Kingston and John Sevier plants.

SAYS HE PRESENTED ARGUMENT

COOPER said it was he who presented to Eisenhower the argument that the Federal Government has an obligation to expand the power-production facilities of the TVA.

"I took this position on TVA," COOPER said. "It's established—it's there. By authority of the Congress, in 1939, the TVA became a monopoly when it bought up all the privately owned public-utilities companies of the area—those represented by Wendell Willkie.

"The effect of that purchase of the companies was to take away from the area any chance for expansion by privately owned utilities. So the people of the region have a right to look to Congress for a normal expansion, just as people in other areas look to privately owned companies to expend when they need more power.

"The President, by approving the Kingston and John Sevier units, recognized my point that Congress, having created the power monopoly in the valley, has an obligation to expand the power production.

"WHAT SHALL LIMITS BE?"

"The problem facing the President and the rest of us is: what shall the limits of the area be? You could keep on expanding indefinitely. If you had eight such valley authorities in the country, and all expanded without limit, you soon would have all the Nation supplied by Federal authorities and no more privately owned utilities.

"I'm not for that. I think we might have one more valley authority out West, to serve as another experimental workshop, to serve as TVA has—as a comparison. TVA has kept rates low and given a demonstration in a difficult field.

"It's a question in my mind whether the Fulton steam plant near Memphis would represent normal expansion. I urged the President to include it. But I believe he may have been wise to omit it for the time being.

"If, in another year, normal expansion appears to call for the new plant at Fulton, we can advocate its construction."

SMOTHERED WITH LOVE

Representative NOBLE J. GREGORY, a Democrat from Mayfield, in the heart of the TVA region of Kentucky, who was largely responsible for construction of Kentucky Dam at Gilbertsville, put his reaction to the President's remarks in one sentence.

Told that Eisenhower had said he was for TVA, but against the creeping socialism that would go with expanding it, GREGORY said:

"The President is smothering TVA with his love."

Cooper's Democratic fellow Senator from Kentucky, EARLE C. CLEMENTS, said:

"It's very disturbing to me to find anyone in the Government who would want to take any action which would retard the industrial development of the TVA region, of which Kentucky is a part."

[From the Nashville Tennessean of June 20, 1953]

COME AND SEE, MR. PRESIDENT

Although Mr. David Lillenthal has won prominence in recent years as a defender of bigness in business, TVA is his first love, and he is still ready to defend it with his old-time effectiveness.

With all the vigor that marked his service as chairman of the TVA board, he has taken issue with President Eisenhower's bland statement that he considers TVA as a shining example of what is meant by "creeping socialism."

The trouble with the President, Mr. Lillenthal observes, is that he doesn't know what he is talking about. And the best way to get the facts is to visit the region and study the workings of the great experiment which, in Mr. Lillenthal's opinion, is about as socialistic as the Panama Canal.

At last reports the Republican national administration had launched upon no campaign to ruin the effectiveness of the canal, which resulted from vigorous leadership of an earlier Republican President, and ultimately turn it over to private industry.

President Eisenhower talks a good deal about decentralization of Federal functions away from Washington in a partnership with State, county, and local communities.

But if you were looking for a better example of such a program, says Mr. Lillenthal, you would find it in the TVA.

"In that region," he adds, "the President will find about the finest example of individualism and individual enterprise to be found anywhere."

And he might have reminded that "free enterprise" in the Valley region stands firmly in support of that which the Republican leader condemns.

President Eisenhower clearly needs to be informed about the subject he discusses on so many occasions and in such a confusing and conflicting manner, and there is perhaps no better man for the role of educator than Mr. Lillenthal himself. Having begun the process of enlightenment, he will serve the South and the Nation well by a continuing course of instruction.

WHY BOTTLE UP IN THE RULES COMMITTEE A MORAL COMMITMENT, H. R. 1, AND THEN INSIST ON REPORTING AN IMMORAL PROPOSAL, THE EXCESS-PROFITS TAX?

(Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I again call to the attention of the Members of the House that each promised a reduction of individual income taxes to his constituents if they would vote for him to represent them in the House of Representatives. This was last November 1952. Each of you sought the ballots of the sovereign citizens in your congressional district on your solemn promise. Not one of you would be here as a Representative in the greatest legislative body in the world had you promised your constituents not to reduce taxes and not to reduce expenditures.

To make sure that the Republican Party and all candidates whether Republican or Democrat would have an early opportunity to reduce taxes and keep their pledge, I introduced H. R. 1 on the opening day of this 83d Congress.

It was introduced with the approval of the Speaker of the House of Representatives as the No. 1 bill, H. R. 1. It was referred to the Ways and Means Committee. Without delay the committee reported the bill favorably by a vote of 21 to 4. I asked the chairman of the Rules Committee in writing for a rule to bring H. R. 1 to the floor for a vote. I received no reply. Again I asked in writing to be heard for a rule to bring H. R. 1 to the floor for action. A reply in writing came refusing my request.

These steps were taken by me as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee by direction and motion of the committee. The prompt enactment of H. R. 1 raises a high moral obligation. To repudiate and dishonor the promise

to reduce the income taxes is to obtain office under false pretense. Failure to honor promises made to get votes raises the question of national security.

How far can sovereign citizens trust their liberties to the hands of those who are false to the promises made to obtain power?

The bill, H. R. 1, to reduce individual income taxes, 11 percent, now held in the Rules Committee, which by its terms would become effective on July 1, 1953, will, if not enacted into law by July 1, deprive 30 million taxpayers subject to the withholding tax of 11 percent tax reduction on that date.

We hear offered as an excuse for not passing H. R. 1 that the benefit of tax reduction will come automatically on December 31, 1953. This means that by political chicanery 50 million taxpayers will be swindled out of \$1,500,000,000. Instead of our taxpayers being relieved of this crushing burden, this amount with other funds will go to enable Great Britain to further lower her taxes. This sum so lost to our taxpayers can never be regained.

Now then, what does the leadership of the House propose instead of a tax reduction in discharge of a moral obligation? It urges the enactment of a tax increase by means of an immoral, iniquitous excess-profits tax, which has been indicted, condemned, as a vicious tax by every Secretary of the Treasury since June 30, 1919, until approved and urged by the present Secretary of the Treasury.

This proposed excess-profits tax is destructive to the life and expansion of our economy as a cancer eating at the vitals of a human body.

The excess-profits tax acts as a cut-throat to small business, knifes every business that tries to expand, destroys potential payrolls, promotes extravagance and waste and penalizes the well managed and efficient industry.

To pass the excess-profits tax to obtain the insignificant revenue it would produce if any would be as senseless and immoral as to license a bootlegger to operate on condition that he divide the profits with the Treasury.

Here is what past Secretaries of the Treasury have had to say about the excess-profits tax.

Secretary of the Treasury Glass in his report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, after the end of World War I, made the following statement:

The Treasury's objections to the excess-profits tax, even as a war expedient * * * have been repeatedly voiced before the committees of the Congress. Still more objectionable is the operation of the excess-profits tax in peacetimes. It encourages wasteful expenditures, puts a premium on overcapitalization, and a penalty on brains, energy, and enterprise, discourages new ventures, and confirms old ventures in their monopolies.

Secretary Houston in his report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1920, urged the repeal of the excess-profits tax:

The reason for the repeal of the excess-profits tax should be convincing even to those who, on grounds of theory or general political philosophy, are in favor of taxes of this nature. The tax does not attain in practice the theoretical end at which it aims. It dis-

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued
For actions of

June 25, 1953
June 24, 1953
83rd-1st, No. 115

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....14,27	Housing.....8	Postal rates.....10
Commodities.....7	Lands, grazing.....16	Rubber.....22
Disaster relief.....19	reclamation.....24	St. Lawrence seaway.....12
Education.....21,26	submerged.....3	Surplus property.....19
Electrification....5,11,20	Loans, farm.....8,25	Tariffs.....23
Expenditures.....13	Marketing.....25	Trade, foreign.....4
Extension service.....21	Organization,	Transportation.....7
Farm credit.....6	executive.....6	War powers.....2
Foreign aid.....1,17	Personnel.....9,15	Wheat.....1,18

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee ordered reported FCA reorganization bill. House passed trip-leasing bill. Senate concurred in House amendment on wheat-for-Pakistan bill. Ready for President. Senate committee ordered reported trade agreements bill.

SENATE

1. WHEAT; FOREIGN AID. Agreed to House amendment to S. 2112, providing for the transfer of 1 million tons of price-supported wheat to Pakistan (p. 7346). This bill will now be sent to the President.
2. WAR POWERS. Passed without amendment H.R. 2557, to extend title 2 of the First War Powers Act (contract authority of the President) through June 30, 1954 (pp. 7347-49). This bill will now be sent to the President.
3. SUBMERGED LANDS. Continued debate on S. 1901, to provide for U.S. jurisdiction over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, adopting a Hill amendment earmarking revenue from this bill for national defense expenses during the national emergency, and afterwards for educational grants-in-aid (pp. 7347, 7350, 7356-84, 7388-93).
4. FOREIGN TRADE. The Finance Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) with amendments H.R. 5495, to extend for 1 year the President's authority to enter into reciprocal trade agreements. The "Daily Digest" states: "Major amendments adopted by the committee would (1) delete from the bill that section increasing membership of the Tariff Commission from 6 to 7, (2) provide that in those cases where the law requires submission of a report to the President, the decisions shall be reported to the President, and (3) provide certain modifications to title 3 of the bill dealing with the establishment of a Commission on Foreign Economic Policy." (p. D605)

5. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Kefauver spoke on the purposes and contributions of TVA, including its effect on the agricultural program of the Tennessee Valley, and stated that TVA was "the best friend private enterprise ever had" (pp. 7350-56).

HOUSE

6. FCA REORGANIZATION. The Agriculture Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H.R. 4353, the FCA reorganization bill. The "Daily Digest" states, "The bill was amended so as to contain most of the revisions proposed by the Department of Agriculture and incorporated in H.R. 5359, a clean bill that was being considered in lieu of H.R. 4353." (p. D606).
7. TRANSPORTATION. Passed as reported H.R. 3203, the trip-leasing bill (pp. 7402-30). The bill would vacate that portion of an ICC order which prohibits motor-vehicle leases of less than 30 days, and would deny to the Commission for the future the power to issue orders which seek to control the duration of such leases. Rejected, 38-136, an amendment by Rep. Hinshaw that would have exempted trucks from ICC regulations on their current trip (as to duration of trip and price) if their preceding haul had been composed of agricultural or other exempt commodities (pp. 7419-29).
8. HOUSING. The Rules Committee reported a resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 5456, to extend to June 30, 1954, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title 3 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (pp. 7397, 7441-42).
9. PERSONNEL. Agreed to the Senate amendment to H.R. 4126, to continue employee war-risk hazard and detention benefits until July 1, 1954 (p. 7402). This bill will now be sent to the President.
10. POSTAL RATES. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) S. 971, to authorize films and related material for educational use to be transmitted through the mails at the rate provided for books. (p. D607).
11. ELECTRIFICATION. The Public Works Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H.R. 4351, authorizing Niagara River power development by private enterprise (pp. D607-08).
12. ST. LA RENEE TWA AY. Rep. Bailey spoke against this project, claiming that it would bring serious harm to Va. (p. 7400).
13. EXPENDITURES. Rep. Scott urged a cut in Government expenses and support of the president's program to balance the budget (p. 7401).
14. APPROPRIATIONS. Rep. Roosevelt urged that House conferees be appointed on H.R. 4663, first independent offices appropriation bill for 1954, so that action could be completed on this bill (The Senate appointed conferees on May 20) (p. 7401).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

15. PERSONNEL. Extension of remarks of Sen. Butler on "policy-influencing" positions in the Government, including two newspaper editorials on this subject, one of which states that "in the Dept. of Agriculture alone 20 top posts related to policy are under civil service" (pp. A3971-2).

T. 18 N., R. 25 E., sections 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, and 16; sections 17, $S\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$ and $SE\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$; sections 18, 20, 21, and 22; section 23, $S\frac{1}{2}$ and $SW\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$; section 24, all; section 25, $N\frac{1}{2}NE\frac{1}{4}$; section 26, all; section 27, $W\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$ and $NE\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$; section 28, all; section 29, $S\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$, $NE\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$, and $SE\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$; sections 30, 32, 33, and 34; section 35, $SW\frac{1}{4}$ and $SW\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 36, all;

T. 18 N., R. 26 E., section 2, all; section 4, $W\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$ and $NW\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$; section 6, all; section 8, $NW\frac{1}{4}$, $W\frac{1}{2}NE\frac{1}{4}$, $N\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $SW\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$, and $NW\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$; sections 10 and 12; section 16, $NE\frac{1}{4}$ and $SE\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$; section 18, all; section 20, $E\frac{1}{2}$, $S\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$, and $NE\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$; sections 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, and 36;

T. 18 N., R. 27 E., sections 1, 2, 4, 6, and 8; section 9, $S\frac{1}{2}$; sections 10 through 16, inclusive; section 18, all; section 19, $S\frac{1}{2}$; sections 20 through 28, inclusive; sections 33 through 36, inclusive;

T. 18 N., R. 28 E., section 5, $SE\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$, $NW\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$, and $SW\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$; section 6, $W\frac{1}{2}$, $SE\frac{1}{4}$, $S\frac{1}{2}NE\frac{1}{4}$, and $NW\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$; section 7, all; section 8, all except $NW\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$; section 9, $SE\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$ and $E\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 15, $S\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $NE\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $SE\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$, and $NW\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$; sections 16 through 21, inclusive; section 22, $SW\frac{1}{4}$, $E\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$, and $E\frac{1}{2}W\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$; section 27, $SW\frac{1}{4}$ and $W\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$; sections 28 through 33, inclusive; section 34, $W\frac{1}{2}$ and $S\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 35, $SW\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $SW\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$, $E\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$, and $SE\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$;

T. 18 N., R. 29 E., section 1, all except $SW\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$; section 2, $NE\frac{1}{4}$, $N\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$, and $NE\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$; section 3, $NE\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$, $NW\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$, $S\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$, and $NW\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$; section 4, $SW\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$, $NE\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$, and those parts of the $SE\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$ and $NW\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$ north of "LK" Lateral; section 6, $N\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 9, $E\frac{1}{2}W\frac{1}{2}$ and $SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 12, $NE\frac{1}{4}$, $S\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$, $SE\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$, and that part of the $NW\frac{1}{4}$ north of L Line Canal; section 13, $S\frac{1}{2}$, $S\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$, and $N\frac{1}{2}NE\frac{1}{4}$; section 16, $NE\frac{1}{4}$ and $N\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 18, $SE\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 21, $SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 24, $N\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $SW\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $NW\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$, $NW\frac{1}{4}$, $W\frac{1}{2}NE\frac{1}{4}$, and $NE\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$; section 25, $SW\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$ and $SE\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$; section 26, $N\frac{1}{2}N\frac{1}{2}$; section 35, $S\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$;

T. 18 N., R. 30 E., sections 1 through 10, inclusive; sections 16 through 18, inclusive; section 19, $E\frac{1}{2}$, $E\frac{1}{2}W\frac{1}{2}$, and $NW\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$; sections 20 and 29; section 30, $E\frac{1}{2}$, $E\frac{1}{2}W\frac{1}{2}$, and $W\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$; section 31, $E\frac{1}{2}$, $SW\frac{1}{4}$, and $N\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$; section 32, all;

T. 19 N., R. 23 E., sections 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, and 36;

T. 19 N., R. 24 E., sections 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, and 36;

T. 19 N., R. 25 E., sections 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, and 36;

T. 19 N., R. 26 E., section 2, all; section 4, $E\frac{1}{2}E\frac{1}{2}$, $W\frac{1}{2}W\frac{1}{2}$, $NE\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$, $NW\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$, $SE\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$, and $SW\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$; sections 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, and 22; section 24, $N\frac{1}{2}$, $SW\frac{1}{4}$, and $NW\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 26, $N\frac{1}{2}$, $SW\frac{1}{4}$, and $NW\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$; sections 28, 30, 32, and 34; section 36, all except $NW\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$;

T. 19 N., R. 27 E., section 2, all except $S\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$ and $N\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$; section 4, all; section 6, all except $S\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 8, $E\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$, $NE\frac{1}{4}$, and $NE\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$; section 10, all except $SW\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 12, all except $SW\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$; section 14, $N\frac{1}{2}$ and $N\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$; section 16, all; section 18, $N\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$, $SW\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$, $E\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $W\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$, and $SE\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 20, $N\frac{1}{2}$ and $NE\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 22, $SE\frac{1}{4}$, $E\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $SW\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$, and $NW\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$; section 24, $SW\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$; section 26, all; section 28, all except $NW\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$; section 30, all except $NW\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$; sections 32, 34, 35, and 36;

T. 19 N., R. 28 E., sections 1 and 2; section 3, $E\frac{1}{2}$; section 4, all except $SW\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$; section 6, $SE\frac{1}{4}$, $S\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$, and $S\frac{1}{2}N\frac{1}{2}$; section 8, $SE\frac{1}{4}$, $W\frac{1}{2}NE\frac{1}{4}$, and that part of the $E\frac{1}{2}NE\frac{1}{4}$ lying north and east of Soda Lake meander line; section 10, all except $SW\frac{1}{4}$ -

$NW\frac{1}{4}$ and $NW\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$; sections 11 and 12; section 13, $N\frac{1}{2}N\frac{1}{2}$ and $SE\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$; section 14, $NW\frac{1}{4}$, $NE\frac{1}{4}$, $N\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $SW\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$, and $NW\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 15, $N\frac{1}{2}$, $N\frac{1}{2}S\frac{1}{2}$, $SW\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$, and $SE\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 16, $SE\frac{1}{4}$, $NE\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$, $S\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $NE\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$ and $E\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$; section 17, $W\frac{1}{2}W\frac{1}{2}$, $E\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$, $NE\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $N\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$, and $S\frac{1}{2}S\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 18, $SE\frac{1}{4}$ and $N\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$; section 20, $E\frac{1}{2}W\frac{1}{2}$, $NW\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$, $SW\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $NE\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$, $SW\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$, and $NW\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 21, $NE\frac{1}{4}$, $E\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$, $SW\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$, $N\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $SW\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $W\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$, and $SE\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 22, $SW\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$, $NW\frac{1}{4}$, and $NE\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$; section 23, $NE\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 24, $NW\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$; section 26, $N\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$; section 30, $W\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$; section 31, $W\frac{1}{2}$ and $W\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$;

T. 19 N., R. 29 E., section 1, all; section 2, $SE\frac{1}{4}$, $S\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$, and $SE\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$; section 3, $S\frac{1}{2}$; section 4, $SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 5, $W\frac{1}{2}$; section 6, all; section 7, all except $SE\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 8, $NW\frac{1}{4}$, $W\frac{1}{2}NE\frac{1}{4}$, $N\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$, and $NW\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 9, $E\frac{1}{2}$; sections 10 through 14, inclusive; section 15, $S\frac{1}{2}$, $NE\frac{1}{4}$, and $E\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$; section 16, $N\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$, and $SW\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$; section 17, $SE\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 18, $E\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$ and $NE\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$; section 20, $E\frac{1}{2}$, $E\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $SW\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$, and $SE\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$; sections 21 and 22; section 23, $NW\frac{1}{4}$, $W\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $NE\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $W\frac{1}{2}NE\frac{1}{4}$, and $NE\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$; section 24, $N\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$ and $NW\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$; section 27, $NW\frac{1}{4}$; section 28, $N\frac{1}{2}$; section 29, $N\frac{1}{2}$ except $SW\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$; section 36, $S\frac{1}{2}S\frac{1}{2}$;

T. 19 N., R. 30 E., section 2, $NW\frac{1}{4}$ and $W\frac{1}{2}NE\frac{1}{4}$; section 3, $W\frac{1}{2}$ and $NE\frac{1}{4}$; sections 4 through 7, inclusive; section 8, $W\frac{1}{2}$ and $NE\frac{1}{4}$; section 18, $N\frac{1}{2}$ and $W\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$; section 23, $NE\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$; section 24, $S\frac{1}{2}$, $E\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$, and $W\frac{1}{2}NE\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$; section 25, all; section 26, $SE\frac{1}{4}$ and $S\frac{1}{2}NE\frac{1}{2}$; section 27, $SE\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$ and $W\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$; section 28, $W\frac{1}{2}$, $W\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$, $SE\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$, and $E\frac{1}{2}NE\frac{1}{4}$; section 29, all; section 30, $E\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$ and $S\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$; section 31, $S\frac{1}{2}$, $W\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$, and $E\frac{1}{2}NE\frac{1}{4}$; sections 32 through 36, inclusive.

T. 19 N., R. 31 E., sections 1 through 3, inclusive; section 4, $E\frac{1}{2}$, $E\frac{1}{2}W\frac{1}{2}$, and $SW\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$; section 6, $N\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$; section 8, $S\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$; sections 9 through 11, inclusive; sections 14 through 16, inclusive; section 17, $E\frac{1}{2}$, $SW\frac{1}{4}$, and $NE\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$; section 18, $E\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 19, $S\frac{1}{2}$, $E\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$, and $NE\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$; sections 20 through 22, inclusive; sections 27 through 34, inclusive;

T. 20 N., R. 23 E., section 20, $S\frac{1}{2}$; section 22, $S\frac{1}{2}$; sections 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, and 36;

T. 20 N., R. 24 E., section 10, $NW\frac{1}{4}$; section 12, $W\frac{1}{2}NE\frac{1}{4}$ and $N\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$; section 16, all; section 18, $S\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$, $NE\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$, $NW\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$, and $NW\frac{1}{4}$; sections 20 and 22; section 24, $SW\frac{1}{4}$ and $SW\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$; sections 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, and 36;

T. 20 N., R. 25 E., sections 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, and 16; section 18, $S\frac{1}{2}NE\frac{1}{4}$ less railroad right-of-way; section 22, $S\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$; section 24, $NE\frac{1}{4}$ and $NE\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$; sections 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, and 36;

T. 20 N., R. 26 E., sections 4, 6, 8, 16, 18, and 20; section 26, $N\frac{1}{2}$, $SE\frac{1}{4}$, and $NW\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$; sections 28 and 30; section 32, all except $E\frac{1}{2}NE\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$; section 34, $SE\frac{1}{4}$, $E\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $SW\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $SW\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$, and $SE\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$; section 36, all;

T. 20 N., R. 27 E., sections 2, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, and 36;

T. 20 N., R. 28 E., sections 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, and 30; section 32, $E\frac{1}{2}$, $NE\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$, $W\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$, and $SE\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$; section 34, all; section 35, $S\frac{1}{2}$; section 36, all;

T. 20 N., R. 29 E., sections 4, 6, and 8; section 10, $W\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$, $NE\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$, $SE\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$, $SE\frac{1}{4}$, $E\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$, and $SW\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$; section 12, all; section 13, $S\frac{1}{2}$, $NE\frac{1}{4}$, $NE\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$, and $SW\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$; section 14, $E\frac{1}{2}$, $E\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $SW\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $SE\frac{1}{4}$, $NW\frac{1}{4}$, and $NW\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$; section 15, $NE\frac{1}{4}$, $N\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$, $SE\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$, $NE\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $NW\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$, and $SE\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 16, $W\frac{1}{2}$; sections 18 and 20; section

21, $W\frac{1}{2}$; section 22, $N\frac{1}{2}NE\frac{1}{4}$ and $E\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$; sections 23 through 26, inclusive; section 27, $E\frac{1}{2}E\frac{1}{2}$, $SW\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$, $S\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$, and $N\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$; section 28, $W\frac{1}{2}$; sections 29 through 32, inclusive; section 33, all except $NE\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$; section 34, $E\frac{1}{2}NE\frac{1}{4}$; section 35, $NW\frac{1}{4}$, $NE\frac{1}{4}$, and $N\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 36, all.

T. 20 N., R. 30 E., sections 1 through 5, inclusive; section 6, $E\frac{1}{2}$, $S\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $S\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$, and $NE\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$; sections 7 through 17, inclusive; section 18, $N\frac{1}{2}$, $SE\frac{1}{4}$, and $NE\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$; section 19, all except $NW\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$; sections 20 through 25, inclusive; section 26, $NW\frac{1}{4}$ and $SE\frac{1}{4}$; sections 27 through 33, inclusive; section 34, $NW\frac{1}{4}$, $SW\frac{1}{4}$, and $SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 35, all; section 36, $NW\frac{1}{4}$, $SW\frac{1}{4}$, and $N\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$;

T. 20 N., R. 31 E., section 1, all; section 2, $W\frac{1}{2}$, $E\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$, $W\frac{1}{2}NE\frac{1}{4}$, and $NE\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$; sections 3 and 4; section 5, $W\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$, $E\frac{1}{2}$, $SE\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$, and $NW\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$; section 6, all; section 7, $NW\frac{1}{4}$, $W\frac{1}{2}NE\frac{1}{4}$, $W\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $NE\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$, and $NW\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 8, all except $NW\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$; section 9, all; section 10, $NW\frac{1}{4}$, $SW\frac{1}{4}$, and $NE\frac{1}{4}$; section 11, $E\frac{1}{2}$, $SE\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$, $E\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$, and $SW\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$; sections 12 through 14, inclusive; section 18, $W\frac{1}{2}W\frac{1}{2}$; section 22, $E\frac{1}{2}$; sections 23 through 26, inclusive; section 27, all except $NW\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$; section 28, $E\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$; section 30, $W\frac{1}{2}W\frac{1}{2}$; section 31, $E\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$; section 33, $E\frac{1}{2}$, $SW\frac{1}{4}$, and $SE\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$; sections 34 through 36, inclusive;

T. 20 N., R. 32 E., sections 3 through 10, inclusive; sections 16 through 21, inclusive; sections 29 and 30;

T. 21 N., R. 25 E., sections 12, 14, 24, 26, 28, 34, and 36;

T. 21 N., R. 26 E., sections 4, 6, 8, 18, 20, 28, 30, and 32;

T. 21 N., R. 27 E., section 36, all;

T. 21 N., R. 28 E., sections 12, 14, 22, 24, 26, 28, 32, 34, and 36;

T. 21 N., R. 29 E., sections 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, and 36;

T. 21 N., R. 30 E., sections 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 35, and 36;

T. 21 N., R. 31 E., sections 1, 2, 4, and 6; sections 8 through 36, inclusive;

T. 21 N., R. 32 E., sections 2 through 11, inclusive; sections 14 through 22, inclusive; sections 27 through 34, inclusive;

T. 22 N., R. 26 E., sections 2, 4, 10, 12, 14, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, and 36;

T. 22 N., R. 29 E., sections 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, and 36;

T. 22 N., R. 30 E., sections 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, and 36;

T. 22 N., R. 31 E., sections 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, and 36;

T. 22 N., R. 32 E., sections 1, 2, 4, 6, and 8; section 9, $E\frac{1}{2}$; sections 10 through 16, inclusive; sections 18 and 20; sections 22 through 36, inclusive;

T. 22 N., R. 33 E., sections 6, 7, and 18;

T. 23 N., R. 26 E., sections 26, 34, and 36;

T. 23 N., R. 29 E., sections 24, 26, 32, 34, and 36;

T. 23 N., R. 30 E., sections 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, and 36;

T. 23 N., R. 31 E., sections 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, and 36;

T. 23 N., R. 32 E., sections 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 35, and 36;

T. 23 N., R. 33 E., sections 30 and 31;

T. 24 N., R. 31 E., sections 24, 26, 32, 34, and 36;

T. 24 N., R. 32 E., sections 20, 22, 26, 28, 30, 32, and 34.

ownership and control. Those responsibilities, and the advantages and disadvantages inherent in them, should be placed in the farmers who have paid in their hard-earned dollars on repayment contracts. That is the basic purpose of this bill.

If I might take several minutes, I would like to turn back the pages of history on federally financed reclamation development in this country. One of my late distinguished predecessors who represented the State of Nevada in both Houses of the Congress was the Honorable Francis G. Newlands, popularly called the father of reclamation development in the United States.

He introduced the first reclamation act in 1901 while a Member of the House of Representatives. He worked against great odds for the passage of this act in 1902. President Theodore Roosevelt paid him the highest of compliments for his foresight and understanding at the time the act was signed into law.

One year later the country's first reclamation project was authorized by the Congress in the State of Nevada and work estimated to cost \$8 million was begun. In 1919 this development was named the Newlands' project in honor of Senator Newlands.

I need not recount what reclamation has meant to the Nation and especially the West in developing natural resources, irrigating untold thousands of acres of farmlands, harnessing water power, and building industrial empires.

Originally the Newlands' project was designed to place under cultivation some 20,000 acres of arid Nevada land in addition to providing hydroelectric power in the Truckee-Carson River Basins. Today that project has 53,458 acres under cultivation, and carrying out the prophecy of the late Senator Newlands, the desert has bloomed.

The project includes storage facilities at Lake Tahoe on the Nevada-California border and Boca Reservoir on the Truckee River and the Lahontan Reservoir on the main Carson River. In addition there are many miles of canals, a powerplant at Lahontan Dam, distribution and drainage systems, pipelines, power-distribution lines, telephones and telephone lines, and some buildings, in addition to the land involved.

I might point out that the farmers on the Newlands' project have been the victims of multiple mistakes which experience has given the Reclamation Bureau a better perspective and guidance from which the country has benefited. It was a trial-and-error operation by necessity, but the farmers of Nevada paid for those mistakes. Now they believe they have earned the right to own and control the project which their labors have purchased.

The Truckee-Carson irrigation district contracted with the Federal Government in December 1926, to become the operating agency of the Newlands' project and a repayment program was begun. Today the farmers have an outstanding indebtedness of less than \$300,000 owing to the Federal Government.

At a time in the near future when these farmers have repaid every dollar of the Government's investment, I believe those farmers should be given full ownership. Such would be to the best interests of the Federal Government. It would be divested of future expenses and the criteria of private enterprise from governmental investment would be served.

This legislation is not a Department of Interior bill although I am most hopeful that the Department will sanction its passage. My bill merely restates the demands of the people of my State.

I believe this bill truly represents democracy at work where the farmers themselves by their initiative and years of toil have repaid construction and interest costs to a

Federal Government which envisioned the need for great reclamation development and used the State of Nevada and its farmers as the trial stage.

I believe it wholly consistent that Nevada as the site of the first reclamation project should also be the site of the first such project that the Federal Government returns to ownership and control of the people it was designed to serve.

JURISDICTION OVER SUBMERGED LANDS OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DANIEL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1901) to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands for certain purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LONG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 1901, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. McCLELLAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 1901, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. LONG) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 1901, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 5376) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 4, line 23, after the matter stricken out, insert the following: "Provided further, That funds appropriated herein may at the discretion and under the direction of the Chief of Engineers be used in payment to the accounts of the Confederated Tribes of the Yakima Reservation; the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation; the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation; or other recognized Indian tribes, and those individual Indians not enrolled in any recognized tribe, but who through domicile at or in the immediate vicinity of the reservoir and through custom and usage are found to have an equitable interest in the fishery, all of whose fishing rights and interests will be impaired by the Government incident to the construction, operation, or maintenance of the Dalles Dam, Columbia River, Wash. and Oreg., and must be subordinated thereto by agreement or litigation."

Mr. KNOWLAND also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5376, making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for

other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senate received today the nominations of Irving Salomon, of California, to be a Representative of the United States of America to the Second Extraordinary Session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, and Mrs. Elizabeth E. Heffelfinger, of Minnesota, to be the Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Second Extraordinary Session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. I give notice that these nominations will be considered by the Foreign Relations Committee after 6 days have expired in accordance with the committee rule.

WHEAT FOR PAKISTAN

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a privileged matter, which is Senate bill 2112, to provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan, which has been amended by the House. It is noncontroversial, involving merely the matter of accepting the House amendment which adds only three words to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2112) to provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan, which was, on page 3, line 9, after "the", where it appears the second time, insert "people of the."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the House has deliberated on this bill in the past 2 days and passed it yesterday with an amendment which adds three words to the bill. On page 3, paragraph (b), instead of reading "to give full and continuous publicity in Pakistan to the assistance furnished by the United States," the amendment would make it read, "to give full and continuous publicity in Pakistan to the assistance furnished by the people of the United States."

The administration has no objection to the amendment, and I know of no objection to it. I, therefore, move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Address delivered by him before American Veterans of World War II convention in Beloit, Wis., June 20, 1953.

Public Law 77 - 83d Congress
Chapter 150 - 1st Session
S. 2112

AN ACT

All 67 Stat. 80.

To provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to make available to the President out of wheat stocks acquired through price-support operations not to exceed one million long tons of wheat, during the period ending June 30, 1954, for transfer to the Government of Pakistan upon such terms and conditions as the President determines appropriate, of which seven hundred thousand tons may be made available in order to alleviate starvation and mass suffering threatened by famine conditions in Pakistan and not to exceed three hundred thousand tons to provide such reserve supply as he may determine to be a necessary supplement to such emergency assistance. Commodity Credit Corporation shall deliver the wheat on board vessels in United States ports as directed by the President. At least 50 per centum of the gross tonnage of wheat made available under this Act and transported from the United States on ocean vessels shall be so transported on United States flag vessels to the extent practicable and to the extent such vessels are available at market rates for United States flag vessels.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of making payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities disposed of hereunder, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are equal to the Corporation's investment in such commodities, including handling costs, plus the costs incurred in making deliveries hereunder. Any funds or other assets available to the Commodity Credit Corporation may be used, in advance of such appropriation or payments, for carrying out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 3. No assistance under authority of this Act shall be made available until an agreement is entered into between Pakistan and the United States containing the following undertakings, and any others the President may determine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of this Act, on the part of Pakistan:

(a) To distribute the supplies made available under this Act among the people of Pakistan without discrimination and to provide such supplies free of cost to persons who, by virtue of circumstances beyond their control, are unable to pay for them.

(b) To give full and continuous publicity in Pakistan to the assistance furnished by the people of the United States.

(c) To permit persons designated by the Government of the United States to observe without restriction the distribution in Pakistan of supplies made available under authority of this Act.

(d) To deposit in a special account amounts of the currency of Pakistan equivalent to the amounts of such currency accruing to the Government of Pakistan from the import and sale of commodities furnished as a grant hereunder, this account to be utilized as may be agreed upon by the United States and the Government of Pakistan for the benefit of the people of Pakistan in programs to increase food production and in other projects and programs in the mutual interest of the United States and Pakistan.

(e) To allocate to the use of the Government of the United States 5 per centum of the local currency account established in subsection (d) for use, in accordance with applicable United States laws, for local

All 67 Stat. 81.

currency requirements of the United States, including administrative and operating expenses in Pakistan in connection with assistance supplied by the United States.

(f) To pursue all appropriate measures to reduce its relief needs and to increase production and supply and improve distribution of foodstuffs within Pakistan so as to lessen the danger of similar emergencies in the future.

Termination.

SEC. 4. All or any part of the assistance provided hereunder shall be terminated by the President whenever he, or Congress by concurrent resolution, determines that because of changed conditions continuation of assistance is unnecessary or undesirable. Termination of assistance to Pakistan under this section may include the termination of deliveries of all supplies scheduled under this Act and not yet delivered.

Foreign

credits.

66 Stat. 662.

31 USC 724.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this Act shall affect the applicability of section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953 or other provisions of law to the local currency allocated to the use of the United States in accordance with the agreement provided for in section 3.

Approved June 25, 1953.

IMMEDIATE RELEASE

JUNE 25, 1953

JAMES C. HAGERTY, PRESS SECRETARY TO THE PRESIDENT

THE WHITE HOUSE

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT
UPON THE SIGNING OF THE PAKISTAN WHEAT AID ACT

I am deeply gratified to sign this Act which makes it possible to send up to one million tons of wheat to help avert famine among the people of Pakistan. We are fortunate in being able to help them by sharing some of the fruits of our labor and soil.

Americans have a strong feeling of friendship for the people of Pakistan. We have great admiration for this young country which is engaged in a valiant and determined effort to overcome problems of tremendous magnitude. Their efforts remind us of the turmoil and struggle of our own early days -- and the struggle which confronts us on a broader scale today.

We are proud to have such staunch friends as the people of Pakistan, who are dedicated to the democratic way of life. We are happy to be able to respond to their need with this aid.

The swift action by the Congress in making possible this aid, within two weeks after my message requesting such assistance, reflects the sympathy and concern of the people of the United States for the people of Pakistan.

Our sincere hopes for peace and prosperity go with this grain.

#####

IMMEDIATE RELEASE

JUNE 25, 1953

JAMES C. HAGERTY, PRESS SECRETARY TO THE PRESIDENT

THE WHITE HOUSE

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT
UPON THE SIGNING OF THE PAKISTAN WHEAT AID ACT

I am deeply gratified to sign this Act which makes it possible to send up to one million tons of wheat to help avert famine among the people of Pakistan. We are fortunate in being able to help them by sharing some of the fruits of our labor and soil.

Americans have a strong feeling of friendship for the people of Pakistan. We have great admiration for this young country which is engaged in a valiant and determined effort to overcome problems of tremendous magnitude. Their efforts remind us of the turmoil and struggle of our own early days -- and the struggle which confronts us on a broader scale today.

We are proud to have such staunch friends as the people of Pakistan, who are dedicated to the democratic way of life. We are happy to be able to respond to their need with this aid.

The swift action by the Congress in making possible this aid, within two weeks after my message requesting such assistance, reflects the sympathy and concern of the people of the United States for the people of Pakistan.

Our sincere hopes for peace and prosperity go with this grain.

#####

